DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 034 CS 210 244

AUTHOR	Steele, James; And Others
TITLE	The Teaching of Composition: A Study of the Approach to Writing Skills in Ontario Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges, Related Surveys, and a Bibliography. Volume I.
INSTITUTION	Carleton Univ., Ottawa (Ontario). Dept. of English.
SPONS AGENCY	Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Toronto.
PUB DATE	Dec 80
NOTE	322p.; For volumes II and III, see CS 210 245-246.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Research; Educational Theories; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Experience; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were given to teachers practicing in Ontario Schools, to student teachers, and to faculty members in a survey of the approach to writing skills instruction in Faculties of Education at nine Ontario universities and at two Ontario teacher education colleges. Several of the 15 unanimous recommendations resulting from an analysis of responses are as follows: (1) more financial support should be provided for the production of new composition textbooks at the intermediate and senior levels, (2) more time should be allotted to language arts instruction in general and to writing instruction in particular in the Faculty of Education timetable, (3) representatives of all the Faculties of Education should draw up a common syllabus for an intermediate-senior English course, and (4) Faculty of Education language arts instructors should meet with English instructors on a regular basis to discuss their educational objectives. To ensure inservice teacher education in language arts, the final recommendation suggests that continued certification be dependent on proof of inservice training in areas directly relevant to teachers' work in the classroom and that this relevance be defined in consultation with the Teachers' Federation. Six separate minority recommendations regarding the program are offered. (Appendixes describe the procedures of practicing English teachers in Ontario secondary schools and include sample questionnaires given to both student teachers and practicing teachers.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277034

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION

A STUDY OF THE APPROACH TO WRITING SKILLS IN ONTARIO FACULTIES OF EDUCATION AND TEACHERS' COLLEGES, RELATED SURVEYS, AND A BIBLIOGRAPHY

JAMES STEELE (Principal Investigator)
AVIVA FREEDMAN (Project Co-ordinator)
A.M. BEATTIE
TREVOR BANKS
JAMES DOWNEY
W.R. McGILLIVRAY
ALAN McLAY

and

IAN PRINGLE (Co-investigator)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ian Pringle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was funded under contract by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

VOLUME I

DECEMBER 1980

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, CANADA

CS210244

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report gratefully acknowledge the co-operation and assistance of the members of Ontario Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges, the teachers and teachers-in-training who responded to questionnaire surveys, and the boards of education across the Province that facilitated survey work.

We also thank our many correspondents in Canada and abroad, especially those in the British Council office in Ottawa, the Centre for Information on Teaching English in Edinburgh, the Bay Area Writing Project in California, the New Zealand High Commission in Ottawa, and the Hamilton Teachers College and Christchurch Teachers College in New Zealand.

Consultative services have been rendered by Mrs. Sylvia Middlebro' and Professors Stephen Richer and D.K. Dale. The Teacher Education Library at the University of Ottawa, the Carleton University Library, and Carleton Computing Services have also given valuable assistance.

PREFACE

This Study is a survey of the approach to writing skills in Ontario's teacher-training institutions and of several matters related more generally to the teaching of composition. Its terms of reference are spelled out in a research contract made between Carleton University and the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities in March, 1977. Specifically, Carleton's team agreed to carry out the following tasks:

(a) to report on methods used to train teachers of writing skills in the two Ontario Teacher Education Colleges (then located in Toronto and Hamilton) and in the Faculties of Education in the following Ontario universities: Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian (including Nipissing College), Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, Western Ontario, Windsor, and York;

(b) to review North American literature on the teaching of composition;

(c) to compile a bibliography on the teaching of composition and prepare abstracts of certain categories of items; and

(d) to make recommendations to the Minister of Colleges and Universities on ways to improve the training of teachers of writing skills.

It was further agreed that the scope of this work would be limited to the teaching of expository composition at the senior elementary and secondary levels (grades seven to thirteen inclusive). The research team was to be guided, however, by the following general questions formulated by the Ministry:

(i) What methods for teaching writing skills are given to student teachers, and how much practice do they have in working with these methods?

(ii) What attention is paid to the writing skills of the student teachers themselves, whatever their discipline? What background in English language training do they have? Is a certain level of writing proficiency required for all graduates, and is instruction provided for those who require it?

(iii) Do the educational institutions perceive any problems or anticipate any changes in their approach to writing skills?

(iv) What research or instructional development work in teaching writing skills is currently being undertaken by the educational institutional? Are they are of any relevant research elsewhere?

(v) What research studies related to the teaching of writing skills in schools provide information useful for Ontario teaching institutions?

(vi) What faculties of education are there in Canada and elsewhere whose ideas or practices related to training teachers in writing skills might be utilized effectively by Ontario teacher training institutions?

The completed Study was submitted to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in December, 1980 in three Volumes. The contents of the first Volume consist, for the most part, of an analysis and discussion of responses to three questionnaires on teacher-training courses and programs. The respective respondents were faculty members in the Faculties and Colleges, student-teachers, and teachers practising in Ontario's schools.

The second Volume contains three reviews and a survey, all related more generally to the teaching of composition. The first review is a discussion of several language-arts texts used in courses for training teachers to teach composition in grades seven and eight. The second is a commentary on some 140 articles and monographs dealing with practical classroom procedures for teaching of composition at the secondary level. These items, many of which are listed on course bibliographies given to us by training-course instructors, have been selected from the extensive Bibliography that constitutes the last part of this Study. The third review is an analysis of composition texts approved for use in Ontario's secondary schools. The survey which completes this Volume is a summary of replies from Canadian and foreign correspondents about recent research and teacher-training programs in their respective institutions. While replies came from many jurisdictions, a special effort was made to obtain detailed information from California, New Zealand, and Scotland. The texts of several documents from these jurisdictions are therefore given in full.

The third Volume is the Bibliography. Designed to complement existing bibliographies on the teaching of writing skills, this Volume lists more than 1600 titles - periodical articles, monographs, reports, papers, and theses - published before 1977 in Canada, Britain and the United States. It also includes original abstracts of a large selection of Canadian and British material, and catalogue references to abstracts of American work that have been published by the Educational Resources Information Centre in Washington.

Although members of Carleton's research team represent a variety of backgrounds, each person on the team has a professional interest in the teaching of composition. Mr. Trevor Banks, a practising, secondary-school teacher of English, is currently writing a composition text for classroom use. Dr. Munro Beattie, who is a co-author of Composition for Canadian Universities (1964), taught English at the secondary level before becoming Chairman of Carleton's Department of English. For several years, he was a member of the Provincial Committee that set the Ontario, senior-matriculation examination in English Composition. Dr. James Downey, formerly Carleton's Dean of Arts (Humanities) and currently President of the University of New Brunswick, served on the organizing committee for the 1973 conference on the "Survival of Literacy" held at York University's Glendon College. From 1973 to 1975, he was the Chairman of Committee on the Present State of English Studies (in Ontario schools and universities) of the Ontario Association of Chairmen of English. Dr. Aviva Freedman is a member of Carleton's Department of Linguistics and the Director of Carleton's Writing Tutorial Service. Her published work includes the co-editing (with Professor Pringle) of Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition (1980) and Teaching Writing Learning (forthcoming). Mr. W.R. McGillivray is the Superintendent of Programme for the Carleton Board of Education, with a special interest in the teaching of language. Dr. Alan McLay, a member of Carleton's Department of English, has served as a Co-ordinator of Carleton's Writing Tutorial Service and as a university representative on the English Education Liaison Committee of the Ottawa Valley Education Liaison Council. Professor Ian Pringle, Chairman of Carleton's Department of Linguistics, has co-edited with Dr. Freedman the books mentioned above. He was also a co-organizer (with Dr. Freedman) of the 1979 Conference of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English on "Learning to Write." My own interest in composition stems from occasional service on committees concerned with the assessment of literacy at the secondary and post-secondary levels and from my teaching of undergraduate courses in literature, composition, and logic.

In several respects, this Study is a product of collaboration. The whole team planned the various surveys and reviews and contributed to the design of the questionnaires. All members met with representatives of Faculty-of-Education English Departments in a preparatory meeting at Carleton University, and follow-up visits to surveyed institutions were made by Aviva Freedman, Russell McGillivray, Alan McLay, Ian Pringle and myself. The whole team read and criticized preliminary drafts of several parts of the text and discussed emergent problems. All of this collective work was organized by Aviva Freedman, our Project Co-ordinator.

Although the collective contribution has thus been considerable, the analyses of data, the interpretations of reviewed literature, and the preparation of the various parts of the text are the work of individuals. In Volume I, Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle are jointly responsible for the three surveys of training programmes and for the Conclusion to this part of the Study. The work for the second Volume has been distributed as follows: the discussion of problematic aspects of certain texts used in Language-Arts training courses has been my responsibility; the review of literature on teaching composition at the secondary level has been written partly by Trevor Banks and partly by myself; the review of secondary-school composition texts is the joint work of Munro Beattie and Alan McLay; and the compilation of information about recent research and practices in other jurisdictions has been done by me. In Volume III, the Bibliography is introduced by Aviva Freedman, who also co-ordinated the work for its compilation. Listed items were selected by several team members, and the abstracts were prepared by a research assistant, Mrs. Joy Patel. Mrs. Sylvia Middlebro' gave professional advice on bibliographical questions and assisted with searches.

As different disciplinary perspectives, different kinds of argumentation, and different epistemological assumptions inform the various parts of this Study, it was agreed by the team that responsibility for each part of the text would rest solely with its designated author or authors. Nevertheless, despite these differences in viewpoint, the Unanimous Recommendations, which are drawn from several parts of the first two Volumes, are supported by all members of the team. A complementary set of Minority Recommendations, all based on my review of language-arts texts in the second Volume, represent my views only. Both sets of recommendations are listed in summary form immediately following this Preface.

James Steele (Principal Investigator)
Department of English
Carleton University

December, 1980

UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Ministry provide financial encouragement and support for the production of new composition textbooks at the intermediate and senior levels.

2. That more time be allotted to the teaching of Language Arts in general and to the teaching of writing skills in particular in the Faculty of Education timetable.

3. That representatives of the English Departments of all the Faculties of Education meet together to draw up a common syllabus which will at least define the topics to be covered in an Intermediate-Senior English course.

4. That Faculty of Education Language Arts instructors meet with English instructors on a regular basis to explore and define the similarities and differences in their objectives and methods.

5. That all students entering Faculties of English as Language Arts or English specialists have the following prerequisites:

   - A course in writing and theories of rhetoric;
   - A course in language designed for teachers or generalists.

6. That all students enrolled in concurrent programs as elementary or English specialists take the following courses:

   - A course in writing and theories of rhetoric;
   - A course in language designed for teachers or generalists.

7. That the amount of time devoted to practice teaching be increased substantially.

8. That practice teaching be organized so as to ensure sufficient exposure to a range of activities that will provide student teachers with an overall view of their future work as teachers and also provide more intensive experience in the teaching of writing and language study.

9. That where possible teacher training be organized in such a way that students will first be taught practical classroom procedures, and will then have occasions to practise teaching, with instruction in theory either following practice teaching or concurrent with it.

10. That programs be established to provide in-service training for teachers in the areas of language and especially writing.

11. That where academically sound programs for practising teachers are available in university faculties other than Faculties of Education, these programs be recognized by the Ministry as offering both professional and academic training equivalent to that offered by Faculties of Education in specialized certificate programs.

12. That continued certification be dependent on proof of in-service training in areas directly relevant to teachers' work in the classroom, the relevance to be defined in consultation with the Federations.

13. That the Ministry establish an independent advisory Council on English similar in organization and purpose to Scotland's Committee on English.

14. That the Ministry establish an Ontario Centre for Information on Teaching English similar in organization and function to the Centre for this purpose in Scotland.

15. That the Ministry provide through its ONTERIS computer facility bibliographic information on the teaching of English.

THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS TO TEACH WRITING IN ONTARIO

BY AVIVA FREEDMAN AND IAN PRINGLE

INTRODUCTION

Within the range of subjects that it is the school's responsibility to teach and develop, the ability to write occupies a quite extraordinary position. On the one hand, it is clearly a "basic" ability: without it, the ability to study a large number of other subjects would certainly be seriously impaired, just as it would by the inability to read. Society therefore automatically imputes to writing the status of a "basic" skill: it is one of the most important things our children have to learn in school, and any suggestion that the skill is not being acquired as quickly, as efficiently, or as fully as might be the case is naturally the occasion for expressions of concern by parents, politicians, and the community at large. Moreover in the minds of most of those who have received some education, memories of learning to write loom large among the memories of schooling. For many, the fact that they themselves learned to write, or think they learned to write, while they were at school is taken to constitute a certain expertise: not only did they themselves learn to write; they also know how to teach writing. Consequently people who would never imagine that they could teach such a subject as music, or geography, or literature, seem to have no doubt that they know how writing should be taught. Some of them, in fact, seem to go further; they also assume that they know how to devise tests to ascertain whether or not it has been taught successfully; and some do devise such tests, and publicize the

MINORITY RECOMMENDATIONS
OF
PROFESSOR J. STEELE

1. That the Ministry support the preparation of new texts on the teaching of language at the Intermediate level and that such texts include a detailed treatment of the teaching of composition from Grades 7 to 10.

2. That Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education invite student-teachers to consider evidence that widely accepted Piagetian postulates concerning the function of language in mental development may be untenable.

3. That Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education inform student-teachers of disagreements among theorists as to the effectiveness of talking as a means of developing skill in writing.

4. That new texts on teaching language at the Intermediate level include a detailed treatment of vocabulary enlargement and its relation to the reading of literature, the study of words, and the mastery of composition.

5. That the Ministry's Curriculum Guideline for the Intermediate Division: English be revised to include a detailed discussion of vocabulary enlargement as an instructional goal.

6. That Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education invite student-teachers to consider evidence which indicates (a) that systematic instruction in principles of composition can be an effective means of improving contextual, written speech and (b) that the effective linking of theory and practice may require the instructional use of mediating instruments such as symbolic schemes and self-checking procedures.

results, usually to the accompaniment of a chorus of horrified editorials.

In short, because it is so important in our society, and for that reason so basic in our schools and so central in most people's memories of their own education, writing is one of the school subjects that come to be the object of beliefs that can perhaps best be described as mythical or quasi-religious. Beliefs about the importance of writing, about how writing is learned, about how it is best taught, are typically beliefs to be shared, but not to be questioned. The assured faith in the particular version of the revealed truth that one happens to believe in is typically remarkably impervious to any sort of empirical evidence, no matter how clearly presented.

And yet the key belief about writing in schools is certainly a myth. Learning to write is not something that happens easily and automatically, merely because a few venerable formulas are applied mechanically. On the contrary, it is an extremely difficult undertaking -- so much so that Canada's (and indeed North America's) foremost researchers into the development of writing ability have quite seriously described writing as "probably the most complex constructive act that most human beings are ever expected to perform" (Bereiter and Scardamalia, forthcoming, a). Everything we have learned about writing through research (and in the last decade we have learned an enormous amount) confirms this judgment. So does the testimony of professional writers. One has only to think of Hemingway's rueful description: "It's easy to write. All you have to do is sit in front of the typewriter and bleed." Writing not only requires finely attuned motor skills; it also makes enormous demands on both intellectual resources and emotional resources, and makes these demands simultaneously. The student who is trying to write has to hold on to a range of ideas, often complicated by emotive resonances, and to hold on to them long enough to get them down on paper. The possibility of doing so is further complicated by the fact that, even as one struggles to formulate the ideas and handle the emotions that accompany them, one's attention is always being distracted by more immediate and superficial matters; how to spell a particular word, whether or not a particular punctuation mark is required at a particular point, whether the word one has just written really is the word one was looking for. And if this were not complicated enough, it is further complicated by the fact that the act of writing is itself generative: the process of writing down one's ideas of itself creates further ideas, and the writer is forced to try to judge between the ideas that are already being expressed and the ideas that come jostling in after them, calling for an equal amount of attention.

Precisely because of the mythic status accorded to writing, it is easy to understand why a study exploring the training of teachers to teach writing should have been commissioned in the mid-1970's. Because of the complexities of writing, however, it should be equally understandable that such a study is intrinsically unmanageable. Four things in particular have delayed this report far beyond the timelines originally proposed.

The first is simply the date at which the contract for the study was finally awarded. In our original timeline, we had assumed that the work would begin at the time suggested by the Ministry when the Project was originally submitted for tender, that is, on February 1, 1977 (Letter L.A. McLeod to Professor James Steele, Nov. 24, 1976). In reality, however, the contract was not finally awarded until March 1977, and this fact in itself made the task of surveying student teachers much more difficult than it would otherwise have been: it meant that, by the time we obtained the lists of students from the Faculties to draw the sample, some students were already out on a last practice teaching section with no obligation to return to their institution, and others had already left.

The delay caused by the late date at which the contract was awarded was compounded by a second factor which proved to be far more serious. Although there had been no intimation of any such possibility during our preliminary meeting with officials from the Research Division of the Ministry, when the time came for us to make arrangements to survey practising teachers as we had undertaken to do, we found that neither in the Ministry of Colleges and Universities nor in the Ministry of Education was there any adequate data base that could be used to draw a sample of practising teachers. This fact is in reality quite astonishing; it is still hard to believe that relevant information about a group of people who are so important in our society and so often surveyed for various reasons is not maintained on a computer file and updated annually. If that information had been available to us, we could have drawn a sample of practising teachers almost immediately. Instead we had to scramble to find an alternative. Those of our colleagues who had worked on the Interface Project eventually pointed us towards the Federations and later, having secured their agreement, we were able to go ahead and begin work on the sample of practising teachers.

The combined effect of these two factors was that the survey data, the analysis of which was to be at the heart of our report, was still being collected during the summer of 1977, and in fact was not complete until the end of the summer. By that time, however, those most actively involved in that part of the study had used up all the time they had originally allotted to it. All the remainder of the work had to be completed in spare time carved out of busy professional lives.

Serious as they were, those two factors were relatively minor compared to the other two. The first was simply that it proved to be impossible to limit the scope of the study. Absurdly, we had intended initially to concentrate only on expository writing rather than the whole gamut of writing. Not only could we not find a way to limit our study to the preparation of teachers to teach expository writing; we were not even able to limit it to writing. Repeatedly, we found we had to consider the place of writing abilities in relation to the other language skills, just as we had to come to terms with the place of writing in relation to language generally. And even that did not define effective limits; for example, like all those who discuss English education, we found ourselves having to deal with the old controversies about the relative importance of language study and language abilities versus the study of literature in the English curriculum.

But so far as the content is concerned, we were at least able to limit what we were investigating to English and the Language Arts. When it came to the institutional structures in which prospective teachers were being trained, however, even the subject area of English and the Language Arts proved to be an unrealistic limit. In discussing such matters as practice teaching, for example, or the in-service training of practising teachers, or the possibility of requiring renewed certification in an attempt to ensure effective retraining of teachers, we were aware that we were discussing matters far beyond the boundaries of what we had originally undertaken to do. Our difficulty was that in discussing one small area of teacher training, we found ourselves wanting to make recommendations that would affect teacher training in all subjects and all practising teachers, no matter what their subjects: having undertaken to investigate the training of teachers to teach expository writing, we found that it entailed an investigation of education.

Moreover the subject we were investigating would not lie still. The fourth and perhaps greatest difficulty in the way of our completion of this report was the fact that the 1970's were years of extraordinarily intensive research into writing and the acquisition and development of the ability to write. For better or worse, we imposed an absolute time limit on the Bibliography which forms volume III of the report, and held to it strictly. Most of the remainder of the report, however, was prepared in full awareness of ongoing research activity. Since the time at which we submitted our tender for this study, a number of major book-length studies have been published, and countless articles have revolutionized our understanding of writing ability. The years which have passed since the date we projected for the completion of the study have seen the closing of the Ontario Teacher Education Colleges (a development which some members of the team regret), the publication and mandating of the new Senior and Intermediate English Guidelines, the preparation and publication of the Evaluation and Language Across the Curriculum support documents, the beginning of work on the Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool, the completion of Province-wide studies of writing ability at the Grade 7 and 8 level, a major conference on sentence combining sponsored by the Exxon Foundation (Miami Univ., Oxford, Ohio, Nov., 1978), the internationally acclaimed CCTE conference "Learning to Write" held at Carleton in May, 1979, the Third International English Conference held in Sydney, Australia, in August, 1980, and much more. If the delay in the preparation of our report has apparently been unconscionable, it has enabled us to take into account more fully than we could have hoped to do otherwise the exciting research activity which has been going on incessantly in the meantime.

Indeed, it is now clear that writing has been the subject of a break-through of a kind and scope which are rare in educational research. At the centre of this change is the shift in focus which has characterised so much recent research into the acquisition and development of writing ability: a shift of attention from the product, the completed piece of writing, to the process by which it comes into being, and especially to the earlier stages of the process, the stage known in classical rhetoric as "invention." That shift in itself has made possible a vastly increased understanding of what the writing process really is. It has brought with it an equally radical change in the kind of attention paid to the development of writing abilities. Together, these two new areas of research have created a third, the development and testing of new pedagogical techniques which are grounded in that research. Finally, the whole question of the assessment and evaluation of writing in the schools has been reconsidered thoroughly. We have explored such changes in more detail in our chapter "Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition," which is included in the book of that name (Freedman and Pringle 1980 a). We trust that the delayed presentation of this report has enabled it to draw on some of the strength that has been gained through the reorientation of research in the area of writing.

In view of the complexity of the study of writing, it is hardly surprising that the hope that we expressed in our original tender of becoming more of a team has remained vain. In many respects we are further apart philosophically than we were initially. The division of labour has been as follows. Volume I is the work of Dr. Freedman and Professor Pringle. In Volume II, the review of composition texts is the work of Professor McLay and Professor Beattie; the review of literature was originally the work of Mr. Banks but parts of it have since been considerably extended by Professor Steele, and it now stands as a joint effort; Professor Steele was responsible for the report on practices in other jurisdictions and the analysis of the presuppositions of various text materials. The work on Volume III, the Bibliography, was organised and supervised by Dr. Freedman. All members of the team have discussed chapters I and II of this Volume and most of the contents of Volume II. However, each section of the report is entirely the responsibility of the people identified as its authors, and is not to be taken as representing the view of any other member or members of the team. The recommendations which have been drawn from the reports and which are listed at the front of this volume have been discussed in meetings of the whole team. They fall into two groups. One group are unanimous recommendations which have the support of the whole team; the other are minority recommendations made by Professor Steele alone.

THE FACULTY SURVEY

Introduction

The first part of our investigation was a survey of Faculties of Education by which we wanted to ascertain, firstly, what kinds of instruction in the teaching of writing were offered at the Faculties of Education and Teacher Education Colleges, and secondly, something of the views of those teaching such courses about the nature of their work and the role of such courses in the whole of the professional training of prospective and in-service teachers. The survey proceded by means of a questionnaire which was sent to all the Faculties and Teacher Education Colleges and by a series of follow-up interviews with the respondents, with other members of the Faculties and Teacher Education Colleges, and in some cases by interviews with Deans.

Courses in English and Language Arts

At the time of our investigation, the courses designed to prepare future teachers to teach writing skills fell into two categories. First, there were the Language Arts courses offered to students preparing for E.S.T. 4 certification. At that point,[1] these courses took one of two forms, depending on the institution: either all students took the same course, one which covered the entire elementary spectrum, either K - 8 or K - 10; or students had to choose one of two courses, depending on their area of specialization, one dealing with Language Arts at the primary (K - 3) and junior (4 - 6) levels and one dealing with Language Arts at the junior (4 - 6) and intermediate (7 - 10) levels.[2]

The second category includes those courses offered to students preparing for certification as high school assistants.

---

[1] The investigation for this report took place in the spring of 1977; the courses described, consequently, are those offered by the Faculties of Education and Ontario Teacher Education Colleges during the academic year 1976/77. However, in their reports to us, the various faculty members did not anticipate any major changes in their programs, except those relating to the introduction of the Ontario Teaching Certificate, and apart from the closing of the Ontario Teacher Education Colleges, this has proven to be largely the case.

[2] The new Ontario Certificate should create certain changes in structure. According to the new organization, all teachers will graduate with the same certificate, the O.T.C.; during training, however, each student-teacher will specialize in one of these three areas: primary-junior, junior-intermediate, or intermediate-senior. What this will mean in connection with the course structures outlined above is that those institutions that simply had one overall

Typically, these were entitled "English" rather than "Language Arts" in the calendars and were described as preparing students to teach English either in the high school or in grades 7 - 12 or 13.

In theory, all these courses overlap to a certain extent in that most of them prepare students to teach English or Language Arts to pupils in grades 7 - 10. Nevertheless, although the differences within each category are not major, there are marked differences between categories, that is, between the courses designed for high school specialists and those designed for elementary or junior-intermediate specialists. The Language Arts courses differ markedly from the English in design, philosophy, and orientation. For this reason we have chosen to deal with each separately.

---

elementary Language Arts course will need to have two, one for primary-junior specialists and one for junior-intermediate specialists. The secondary courses will probably be relatively unaffected, although those institutions which described their courses as preparing students to teach English in the high school will have to broaden the scope to include grades 7 and 8.

1.2 Language Arts Courses

Every student in the province enrolled in a program leading to E.S.T. 4 certification had to take a Language Arts course. All institutions made this requirement. However, no institution which offered a consecutive program required more than one such course, although some Faculties did offer other related courses as options. The time allotted to these courses varied: one institution required only fourteen hours of class time over the entire academic year; a second only twenty hours of class time. Others scheduled up to three hours a week, which, over the eighteen to twenty available weeks,[1] amounted to a total of fifty-four to sixty hours.

That only fourteen hours or twenty hours should be allotted to Language Arts seems incredible; even sixty hours seems paltry when the scope of what must be learned is considered. The Language Arts form the basis of the elementary school curriculum; comprised under that term are reading (including the study of literature in the upper grades), speaking, listening, and writing (including all forms of language study). Students come to the Faculties of Education presumably equipped with these skills themselves but certainly with neither a theoretical understanding of the nature of these activities nor with any sense of the pedagogic techniques necessary to teach them. In other words, they come with neither content nor methodology, and the Language Arts instructors at the Faculties of Education do not seem to expect the situation to be otherwise. To be sure, many were dissatisfied with their students' background knowledge in such fields as linguistics or children's literature. But no one seemed to expect the students to have learned about, say, the processes of reading or listening in their undergraduate courses.

---

[1] There is some variation as well in the number of weeks that these institutions are in session.

[2] One institution had extended the time available to Language Arts significantly by organizing its program differently; two separate courses were offered, one on Curriculum Development, which focused on language, and another on Instructional Techniques, which presented various teaching strategies and evaluation techniques appropriate to all disciplines. On the accompanying chart, however, we have listed only the number of hours devoted specifically to curriculum development, since it was difficult to estimate what proportion of the course dealing with instructional strategies related directly to Language Arts.

A Language Arts course, then, must include, first, an explanation of current theories concerning the nature of the processes of reading, speaking, listening, and composing; second, an analysis of the practical implications of these theories; and, third, a presentation of pedagogic techniques and evaluative procedures that take both the theory and its implications into account. With the current course structures, all this apparently had to be achieved in somewhere between fourteen and sixty hours of class time.

Moreover, because of the nature of the material and the objectives of these courses, the instructors often used teaching strategies that are considerably more time-consuming than straight lecturing. For example, at one university, the forty hours available for Language Arts were divided into twenty two-hour segments. During one hour, "theory and philosophy were presented briefly with opportunities for discussion"; the second hour was devoted to demonstration lessons by the students.

Demonstration lessons take time; they must, of necessity, mimic the slower pace of the elementary school classroom. This is not to question their usefulness or relevance. What students undoubtedly welcome most at this stage is a precise step-by-step dramatization of how they ought to deal with the day-to-day issues of elementary school teaching. Nevertheless, by choosing to present so many demonstration lessons, these instructors limited the already limited time even further. The "theory and philosphy" must have been dealt with in a cursory way. Furthermore, even though half the course, that is twenty hours, was given to this very detailed presentation of classroom techniques, the students would still have at best only a taste of what they might encounter in their teaching. After all, twenty lessons hardly cover the gamut of possible lessons in the Language Arts dealing with reading, writing, spelling, handwriting, language study, literature, listening, and all possible integrated combinations and aimed at pupils in grades 4 - 10, ranging from retarded to gifted. The lessons had to be selective and could only give the students a sample of what they might be doing.

In fact, every Language Arts instructor, each in his own way, was forced to be extremely selective. One professor, whose time constraints were particularly severe, had chosen to present these

Language Arts courses in a seminar format, with groups of students choosing from among the topics to present material for the class as a whole. Clearly all the topics from which the students might choose were of direct relevance to the teaching of Language Arts; however, the limitations of time were such that only a number of these topics could be presented in any depth, and the instructor had chosen to allow the interests of the students to determine what ought to be covered, presumably assuming that the students would be motivated by a strong interest in a particular subject, or by a sense of their own inadequacy, or by their perception of what would be most useful. The assumption appears to have been that students would work more effectively when self-motivated in this way.

By selecting the seminar format, this instructor opted to substitute depth for the breadth that is clearly not possible. Underlying this strategy was the hope that, in the course of preparing their particular assignments, the students would develop the appropriate skills, familiarize themselves with the research tools available and, in general, learn how to think about pedagogic matters; the hope, in other words, that the students would discover an approach not so much to the actual teaching of Language Arts as to the preparation for that teaching. Implicit too, was the further hope that students would use the skills thus acquired when they came to prepare for their own teaching, since all the preparation surely still lay ahead of them.

Despite the variation in time and pedagogic techniques in the

Language Arts courses in the Faculties of Education and Teacher Education Colleges, there was a fair degree of agreement as to what should be dealt with in a Language Arts course. The following is a course outline offered by one institution.

English II - Course Outline
1976-1977

Listening

The reciprocal aspects of speaking and listening; the nature and value of listening.

The skills involved in listening; emphasis on advanced listening skills such as critical listening.

Planning listening activities, e.g., the use of tape recorders, role playing, dramatization.

Objective methods of evaluating the listening program.

Speaking

The aims of extending and consolidating the speaking skills; the value to the individual.

The skills involved: socially, the use of contemporary communication media such as telephone, microphone, etc.

Activities to further speech development, such as story telling and reading, choral speaking, public speaking, formal speech such as debate and panel discussions, parliamentary procedures, various types of dramatics.

Reading

Organizing the reading program. The groupings used (ability, interest, other), instructional material available, such as readers, novels, newspapers. The approaches used: the basal reader approach, individualized reading program, the Joplin Plan, others.

Skill areas to be developed: comprehension, word attack skills, study skills.

The directed reading lesson.

Reading levels, the names and characteristics of each, the methods used in ascertaining reading levels (standardized tests, teacher-made tests, informal tests), the interpretation of the data.

Reading in the content areas, the aims, the importance of it, the skills required, the methods available.

Remedial reading with emphasis on the intermediate division. Some of the techniques used.

For each area the philosophy, organization, methodology, and values will be discussed. The inter-relationship of reading with the entire language arts program will be stressed.

Writing

Handwriting, the need for it, method of teaching and evaluating.

Practical writing, utilitarian and realistic, is important in our everyday lives; the discipline of correct mechanics is needed to make it socially acceptable as well as understandable.

Creative writing (or composition) serves a different purpose though the techniques of practical writing help in creative writing. Creative writing would include:

Brainstorming - a demonstration and summary of values, the nature of creativity insofar as it can be determined, value to the individual and to society topics, suited to the grade level (for writing), evaluation of the children's efforts; evaluation workshop

Grammar

Introduction through reference to the history of the language.

Value of grammar in the classroom - a justification for its teaching.

Refresher course in content; types of grammar.

A linguist's approach to the topic.

Spelling

Its place in the curriculum.

Methods of teaching.

Literature in the Language Program

Importance within the language arts program.

Historical basis of literature; myths, legends, short stories, drama.

Sources of poetry and prose; the role of the school librarian, the teaching of research skills.

Literature appreciation lesson, demonstration and discussion.

Oral interpretation of literature, its nature, purpose, and techniques of expressions.

Novel study; the content of lessons and organization for effective instruction.

The role of mass media; the newspaper, magazine, in the language arts curriculum. Ideas for utilization as integration catalysts.

Moral values and the teaching of literature.

The outlines provided by other instructors did not vary greatly from this general framework. One instructor offered a section on language, including functions of language, characteristics of language, growth of language and factors influencing learning; another dealt with Osgoode's theory of communication and Downey's model of curriculum development; yet a third devoted a unit to study skills. Broadly speaking, however, the emphases were the same.

There was, of course, some variation in the course structures depending on whether the course was intended to cover the entire elementary spectrum or simply the junior-intermediate levels, i.e.

grades 4 - 10. Understandably and inevitably the courses that dealt with the entire elementary spectrum, either K - 8 or K - 10, placed a far greater emphasis on the primary grades than on the later years; the attempt to cover the entire range clearly worked to the detriment of the upper years. This situation, however, should be remedied by the new Ontario Certificate; all courses now have to fall into the two-division pattern - either primary-junior or junior-intermediate.

Despite these differences, the general course structures in Language Arts seemed to follow a similar pattern. There also seemed to be broad agreement as to the proportion of time to be devoted to various topics and the specific emphasis to be given to each unit within the larger structure.

On our Faculty Questionnaire, we asked each instructor to estimate the amount of time devoted to the teaching of expository writing as compared to the teaching of creative writing, the teaching of language, and the teaching of all other topics. Table 1.1 shows the comparative breakdown.

What is immediately striking is the degree of uniformity suggested in the responses, especially by contrast to the instructors in secondary education. Fifteen out of seventeen Language Arts instructors said they spent between 10 and 20% of their time discussing expository writing, thirteen out of eighteen spent 10 to 20% of the time on creative writing, and twelve out of eighteen spent the same 10 to 20% of their time on grammar or language study.

Table 1.1

PERCENTAGE OF TIME IN LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES (EXCLUDING PRACTICE TEACHING) DEVOTED TO METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING: CREATIVE WRITING; EXPOSITORY WRITING; GRAMMAR AND LANGUAGE STUDY; AND OTHER TOPICS.

INSTRUCTOR	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Creative writing (the writing of poetry, narratives, plays, etc.)	15	25	15	10	30	15	15	20	5	12	20	20	14	30				
															25	25	25	
expository writing (the writing of essays, editorials, reports, and formal edited composition in general)	15	10	15	10	30	10	15	20	15	12	20	20	-	20				25
grammar and other language study	20	10	20	10	15	15	15	30	30	12	10	20	14		25	25	13	
other	50	55	50	70	25	60	55	30	50	64	40	40		50	50	50	62	75

Moreover, those who differed did not differ radically. The extremes for creative writing were 5 and 30%, and for both expository writing and grammar, 8 and 30%. This contrasts strikingly with the results from the English instructors where, although we received a far smaller number of responses (seven rather than eighteen), the numbers ranged between 0 and 50% for creative writing, between 3.75% and 30% for expository writing, and between 5 and 40% for grammar and language study.

Table 1.2

COMPARISON OF RANGE OF VARIATION AMONG LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTORS VS. SECONDARY ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS

	Language Arts (Elementary)			English (Secondary)		
	Lowest %	Highest %	Range	Lowest %	Highest %	Range
Creative Writing	5	30	25	0	50	50
Expository Writing	8.3	30	21.7	3.75	30	26.25
Language Study	8.3	30	21.7	5	40	35

Of course, when these numbers are translated into actual hours spent, a different picture emerges. (See Table 1.3). Instructors teaching Language Arts might spend anywhere from two to sixteen hours on creative writing, from two and a half to sixteen hours on expository writing, or from two to eleven hours on grammar or language study. The point is that this variation seems to have been caused not so much by the different values

Table 1.3

AMOUNT OF TIME (IN HOURS) IN LANGUAGE ARTS COURSE (EXCLUDING PRACTICE TEACHING) DEVOTED TO METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF TEACHING: CREATIVE WRITING; EXPOSITORY WRITING; AND LANGUAGE STUDY.

INSTRUCTOR	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	Q	R
creative writing (the writing of poetry, narratives, plays, etc.)	8.1	13.5	8.1	4.5	5.4	16.	7.5			8	2	5.8	8	8	2	2.5	2.5
expository writing (the writing of essays, editorials, reports, and formal, edited composition in general)	8.1	5.4	8.1	4.5	5.4	16.2	7.5			8	6	4.8	8	8	-	2.5	2.5
grammar and other language study	10.8	5.4	10.8	4.5	5.4	8.1	7.8			12	12	4.8	4	8	2	5	5

ascribed to the various components of the Language Arts courses by different instructors as by the radically different time allotments for these courses in the various institutions.

There is another point to be made as well. The percentage estimates which we received from the various Language Arts instructors do not always square with the course outlines submitted to us nor with the descriptions of the courses given us during the interviews. The outlines we saw typically included what can be strictly defined as the teaching of expository writing as only a small portion of the whole. Similarly, the handouts that were sent us tended to deal predominantly with other skills despite the avowed nature of our project. Moreover, we heard from more than one instructor that, although the four Language Arts are all important, the stress in recent years has been on speaking and listening. If that is the case, it would suggest that the arts involving the written word, reading and writing, received less than 50%, say 45%. Even if that 45% were to be divided equally (and surely reading, which also includes literature, received, and probably deserves to receive, more attention), it would leave less than 22% for writing of all kinds, including language study. And since there was a universal consensus concerning the importance of creative and personal writing in these years, even 10% seems high for the direct teaching of expository writing.

The estimates of the Language Arts instructors may, of course, have included as training in expository writing the teaching of other skills which are related to, and contribute to, the development of expository skills but which would not necessarily have been included, strictly speaking, under this classification. Certainly, the Language Arts instructors repeatedly expressed to us their feeling that our division was arbitrary and belied the essential integration of all the Language Arts. In fact, there was a fairly widespread feeling in the Faculties of Education, which the Language Arts instructors expressed to us especially during our interviews, that our questionnaire and the study as a whole did not recognize what has universally been accepted as a cardinal principle of Language Arts teaching - that the Language Arts are inextricably interwoven and that good teaching responds to, and takes advantage of, this integration. Many felt as well that our study, by focussing on expository writing, was giving that skill more importance than it merits at that level or perhaps than it merits at any level.

The argument concerning the integration of the Language Arts is well taken and any estimates concerning the percentage of time spent on a particular skill should take into account, first, that much teaching of that skill emerges incidentally in the course of teaching other skills and, furthermore, that the teaching of the other skills is a preparation for the teaching of writing: a solid grounding in reading may be necessary before writing can be undertaken; an immersion in literature develops a sense of writing; the development of oral expression is often a preparation for written expression. Even listening is related to writing: one instructor, at the secondary level, was doing research on how listening to the written word read aloud can affect the development of writing abilities.

Bearing in mind the cautions of the Language Arts instructors concerning the inevitable and inextricable relationships among the Language Arts, we have nonetheless attempted the task of analysis; we have chosen to focus on only one of these arts, specifically writing, recognizing always that the element we are so isolating is part of a larger whole.

In order to determine what topics relating to expository writing were covered in the Language Arts curriculum, we asked each instructor to fill in Form II of our Faculty Questionnaire. This Form listed possible topics that might be touched on in the course of teaching expository writing. We did not intend that this list represent our view of what ought to be taught at any particular level; in their responses, however, the Language Arts instructors revealed their consensus that these are the relevant topics in the teaching of expository writing.

Specifically, we asked the following question: do you teach methods or techniques for reaching any of the following more specific aspects of expository writing and related topics at any level between grades seven and thirteen? Then we listed some sixteen items. The possible responses are these four: no response; 0, meaning no methods or techniques taught; 1, meaning some methods or techniques taught; and 2, meaning methods or techniques considered particularly comprehensive, innovative or effective. The distinction between 1 and 2 was made for the purposes of possible follow-up during our interviews. In interpreting our data, we have collapsed these two under one heading, some methods or techniques taught.

The breakdown, then, for the population as a whole can be seen in Table 1.4. In addition to the raw figures, there is a

Table 1.4

METHODS TAUGHT IN LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES

Methods to Teach	No Methods	Some Methods	No Response	% Total
vocabulary building	0	18	1	95
spelling	1	18	0	95
handwriting	6	12	1	63
punctuation	1	18	0	95
sentence structure	1	17	1	90
levels of usage	0	16	3	84
rhetorical context	5	13	1	68
motivation	0	18	1	95
analysing a topic	3	13	3	68
gathering and classifying material	1	16	2	84
reasoning & evidence	1	16	2	84
making an outline	1	15	3	79
paragraph structure	2	15	2	79
overall coherence (essay structure)	4	12	3	63
revision	1	16	2	84
marking	0	18	1	95

column indicating, for each item, the percentage of the total population responding to our questionnaire who taught some methods. For this purpose, we are assuming that no response is equivalent to 0 or no methods or techniques taught.

Table 1.5 is a breakdown of items according to the percentage of instructors teaching that item.

Table 1.5

PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTORS TEACHING SPECIFIC TOPICS

Percentage of Instructors Teaching	Topics
90-100	vocabulary building spelling punctuation sentence structure motivation
80-89	levels of usage gathering and classifying information reasoning and evidence revision
70-79	making an outline paragraph structure
60-69	handwriting rhetorical context analysing a topic overall coherence (essay structure)

Of the sixteen items we listed, five were taught by over 90% of the instructors, four by over 80%, two by over 70%, and four by over 60%. In contrast, we drew a different response when we asked the following question: do you teach any methods or techniques for dealing with special difficulties in teaching expository writing because of 1) excessive teaching loads and/or large classes or 2) the presence of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, immigrant students (English as a second language or English as a second dialect), etc.? The responses of the Language Arts instructors to these questions were as follows.

Table 1.6

METHODS TAUGHT FOR DEALING WITH SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES

Methods to deal with:	No Methods	Some Methods	No Response	Percentage of Total
excessive teaching loads/large classes	6	9	4	47
presence of students from disadvantaged backgrounds	7	11	1	58

There was far less agreement, then, among the Faculty of Education Language Arts instructors as to the importance of these topics. A similar question concerning the teaching of methods and techniques for applying a number of linguistic topics to the teaching of expository writing yielded the following results in terms of the percentage of instructors teaching any methods at all: psycholinguistics - 11%, sociolinguistics and theories of linguistics standards - 32%, traditional-generative grammar - 42%; systemic grammar (scale and category) - 21%; semantics - 32%.

Aside from the teaching of traditional grammar, there seemed to be broad agreement by the Language Arts instructors in the province on the importance of only that first list of sixteen items relating to the teaching of expository writing (with the possible exclusion of those items receiving only 63% - handwriting and overall coherence or essay structure).

Moreover, the consistency displayed in that section also contrasts with the responses to that same section made by the secondary instructors. For purposes of comparison, we have chosen to define agreement as two-thirds or 67%, so that if more than 67% of the instructors responding used some methods, that is interpreted as agreement; similarly, if fewer than 33% discussed the topic, that too suggested agreement. Of those first sixteen items, the Language Arts instructors agreed on fourteen; the secondary instructors, in contrast, agreed on only ten and disagreed on six.

Simply listing the topics dealt with by the Language Arts instructors does not give any indication as to the approaches taken to the topics. Our itemized breakdown tends to belie the way writing was actually taught or, rather, the way Language Arts instructors urged their students to teach writing. For the majority of Language Arts instructors, although certain of the topics we have listed are handled as separate entities, specifically handwriting and spelling, writing in general was not taught as a set of discrete units to be dealt with separately and in order. Instead writing was regarded as an organic whole which cannot be pretaught as a series of precise steps according to a carefully formulated pattern. Moreover, the focus of the approach was on the writer rather than the written work, the process rather than the product, the learner rather than the teacher. Writing was seen as a complex emotional and intellectual activity growing out of as well as shaping the important experiences of a child's life. Again and again we were told that our distinction between creative writing and expository was an arbitrary one, that the two form a continuum, that what we called "creative" and what others call "expressive" is a necessary foundation for expository writing, and finally that expository writing involves the emotions as well as the intellect.

The teacher's role was described at one institution as follows:

> (a) develop knowledge and excitement about a topic,
> (b) challenge the pupils into action,
> (c) use the finished products in a valuable meaningful way to the students.

In other words, the teacher's role is to prepare the way for the writing by generating ideas, kindling the students' interest, stimulating their imaginations, and, in general, setting the stage for the writing to begin. Once that work is completed, there is another kind of teaching to be done. Presumably at this point the teacher would focus on some of the more specific features of the written work, the rhetorical and stylistic options, the problems of usage, always within the context of the written work and always with discretion, tact, and respect for the writing of the child.

This approach to the teaching of writing had wide acceptance among the Language Arts instructors at the Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges; it is implicit in many of the course outlines and handouts and was frequently made explicit during the course of our interviews. One course outline broke down the teaching of writing thus. (Handwriting and spelling are treated separately.)

> Creative Writing of Prose
>
> What it is?
> Why teach it?
> How to get children to write?
> Evaluation

The focus is clearly on the value of writing as an activity and on teaching the teachers first how to motivate their pupils and then how to evaluate the writing, i.e. how to deal with specific rhetorical, stylistic, grammatical issues within the context of the completed work. Judging from the handouts and the interviews, however, the teacher's responsibility is to prepare for the writing, by making sure, first, that the writers have command of the appropriate linguistic resources and, second, that they have something to write about. It is here that the inevitable interdependence of the Language Arts is most evident. Several instructors insisted that the best preparation for writing is an immersion in literature: by flooding the pupils with good writing at an early age, we give them something to say as well as a language and a style to say it with.

In addition to reading, talking was recommended - in fact, universally recommended - as a prewriting activity. Classroom discussion of all kinds was encouraged; brainstorming sessions were suggested as a method to generate ideas. Some instructors urged formal speeches or debates, the latter specifically as a prelude to the writing of argumentative essays. Others recommended group development of sentences, paragraphs, stories. In addition to the value of talk as a prewriting activity, the development of oral expository skills was regarded as a basis for the development of similar skills in writing.

The kinds of writing considered appropriate for elementary pupils were, first and foremost, journals, then reports on trips and visits, letters expressing opinions, letters asking for information, book reports, and, in some cases, research reports. When the teaching of research papers was presented, teachers were urged to supervise their pupils very closely through all the introductory stages, the initial library research, the amassing of data, the note-taking and summarizing. This kind of writing, however, was introduced, if at all, only very late in the elementary school years.

There was some inevitable disagreement within the Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges as to specific methods. For example, some instructors and some institutions recommended certain types of sentence exercises; two specifically suggested sentence-combining; others, in contrast, laid their primary stress on writing whole compositions, long pieces in fact, not even paragraphs. Despite these differences in detail, the philosophic approaches were the same.

To sum up then, although there was wide divergence in the time allotted to the teaching of Language Arts and consequently to the teaching of writing, there was broad agreement by the instructors as to the integration of all the Language Arts, the relative importance of the various components of the programs, the specific topics to be dealt with in the teaching of writing, and the general approaches to be taken to the teaching of writing.[1]

The major problem that must be confronted by educators concerned with the preparation of Language Arts teachers to teach writing is the unrealistic time allotment for that subject in nearly all the Faculties of Education and Teacher Education Colleges. The time apportionments simply do not accord with the scope of what must be covered, the recent developments that must be taken into account, and the importance of the subject in the school curriculum. Somehow, more time and, in most cases, much more time must be found in order to prepare future teachers adequately. Whether that increase in time ought to come at the expense of other subjects such as Educational Psychology or Foundations or History, or whether the academic year at the

---

1. There was, however, the same fundamental disagreement among Language Arts instructors as there is among English instructors concerning the teaching of grammar. The views of both will be treated in the section on language and grammar. (See page 49).

Faculties should be lengthened to correspond with that of the schools, or whether a two-year program should be introduced, or whether entirely different measures ought to be taken, the Faculties themselves should decide. Clearly, however, some action must be taken to right the imbalance.

Recommendation

> More time must be allotted to the teaching of Language Arts in general and to the teaching of writing skills in particular in the Faculty of Education timetables.

1.3 English Courses

What was immediately most striking about the secondary school teacher preparation in English, especially in contrast to the preparation of Language Arts teachers, was the wide variation across the province. Institutions differed not only in the time allotted to these English courses but also in the emphases and the philosophical assumptions underlying the teaching.

Institutions varied, for example, even in how or whether they distinguish Type A English students from Type B students. To be sure, there was a certain uniformity across all institutions in that all students who intended to teach English at the secondary level as either Type A or Type B specialists had to take a specialized course in the teaching of English. However, at one Faculty of Education, Type A and Type B students took the same course. At another, the Type A and Type B students took a common course, but the former were required to attend an additional seminar. In yet a third institution, there were two entirely distinct courses offered to Type A and Type B students.

This also means that the number of hours of course work varied and indeed varied widely from three hours a week for some Type A and Type B students at some Faculties to eight hours a week for Type A students at one major institution.

The following table shows the amount of time per week allotted to English courses for Type A and Type B instructors in the consecutive program.

Table 1.7

TIME ALLOTTED TO ENGLISH COURSES

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">INSTITUTION</th><th colspan="2">NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK OF COURSE CLASS TIME IN ENGLISH</th></tr>
<tr><th>Type A</th><th>Type B</th></tr>
<tr><td>A</td><td>8</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>B</td><td>4</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>C</td><td colspan="2">3</td></tr>
<tr><td>D</td><td colspan="2">3</td></tr>
<tr><td>E</td><td colspan="2">3</td></tr>
<tr><td>F</td><td colspan="2">3</td></tr>
</table>

Institutions D, E, and F offered the same course to Type A and Type B students. Institutions A and B had separate courses. Institution C had its Type A students take the same course as the Type B students as well as a Type A seminar.

This variation in course structure and time allotment, however, is only a small part of the story. There were also significant differences according to institution and according to instructor in the proportion of time devoted to writing skills within the overall curriculum, in the relative importance ascribed to language study, and, in general, in the approaches taken to the teaching of writing skills as a whole. However, where the course possibilities are so great, where the time limitations are so stringent, and where the theoretical assumptions are potentially so diverse, the instructors must necessarily be selective and it is this selectivity which leads to the wide variety.

Any consideration of the goals for an English program in the Faculty of Education reveals the magnitude of the task confronting Faculty of Education professors. In the one or, at most, two courses directed specifically to the teaching of English, they must acquaint the student-teachers with pedagogical methods for dealing with all aspects of the English curriculum for grades 7 - 13. Assuming for the moment that the student-teachers already have a thorough grounding in literature, rhetoric and language,[1] they must become familiar with the techniques for communicating this knowledge effectively to a wide range of pupils of varying ability levels and at different stages of development.

The department of English at one major Faculty was asked to present a statement of its goals and objectives for a departmental review. That statement is revealing of the scope of the task.

---

[1] That we cannot make this assumption was made evident in the reports of the faculty members concerning the undergraduate preparation of their students. In the section on undergraduate preparation, the specific areas of weakness in the undergraduate training are more precisely defined. These deficiencies contribute as well to the severity of the time constraints felt by Faculty of Education professors, for, before even beginning to present material appropriate to their own curriculum, they must fill in the gaps in their students' background knowledge of rhetoric, language, and theory of writing.

Objectives:

a) What should [the student-teacher] be able to do?

1. to demonstrate his/her ability to treat with effectiveness poetry, drama, short stories, essays, and novels, at the secondary school level.
2. to demonstrate his/her ability to help pupils improve their composition skills.
3. to demonstrate his/her ability to develop a critical awareness of mass media.
4. to demonstrate his/her ability to help pupils develop their skills of speaking, reading, and listening.
5. to evaluate the pupils' oral and written work.
6. to evaluate the pupils' progress.
7. to stimulate the pupils' imaginations.
8. to select appropriate teaching strategies in relation to pupils' needs, interests, and abilities.
9. to conduct teacher-led class discussion with interest and skill.
10. to conduct teacher-led small group discussion with interest and skill.
11. to write standard English.
12. to speak and read English aloud, effectively.
13. to demonstrate that he/she can plan English lessons and units with skill and flair.
14. to make distinctions and defend choices based on taste and sound judgment.

The secondary school English teacher's central function is twofold: to help his/her students respond more sensitively and discriminatively to language, and to help them use language more carefully and imaginatively. The job of the Type B instructor is to acquaint the student teachers with a range of techniques by which they in turn can facilitate these developments in the adolescent students.

b) What should he/she know?

Much of what he/she should know will come from experiences prior to his/her arrival in the Type B English course. The course, however, continually sends him/her back to familiar books and experiences that should refresh this knowledge or highlight gaps in background that need filling. He/she needs:

1. to be familiar with the various English Programs in the Ontario Secondary Schools.
2. to be familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of various methods used in the study of English.

3. to be familiar with recent structural innovations in curriculum design.
4. to know what is meant by the term "the experience of literature".
5. to be aware of the importance of literary training.
6. to be familiar with major themes in literature.
7. to understand the relationship between literature and life and how this connection involves and enriches lives by providing enjoyment, insight.
8. to know the major forms, authors, movements.
9. to understand that there may be several valid interpretations of a literary work: pluralism is not necessarily chaotic.
10. to understand the distinctive characteristics of different genres: poetry, drama, short stories, essays, novels.
11. to understand literary conventions as they apply to each genre.
12. to understand the importance of tone, texture, and context.
13. to understand the concept of modes - comedy, tragedy, tragicomedy, romance, satire, parody.
14. to know the basic principles of literary criticism and their relevance to the secondary school.
15. to know the basic principles of media criticism.
16. to know something substantial of some of the arts outside literature (painting, music, sculpture, theatre, film, dance).
17. to be familiar with the traditional latinate version of English grammar.
18. to know something of twentieth century approaches to describing the grammar of the English language.
19. to know something of the history of the development of the English language.
20. to know the needs, interests, and characteristics of adolescents at various ages as evidenced by their characteristic responses to what they read and write.
21. to know how to excite, inspire, or motivate students to learn and grow in their understanding of their subject and themselves.
22. to know the basics of communication theory and technique.
23. to know some learning theory.
24. to know of the significant research in the teaching of English.
25. to realize how man's unique ability to use words as symbols frees him from time, place, and programmer. His ability to express himself symbolically enables him to examine and evaluate life, to reflect upon it, to re-create it for others, to make judgments about it, and to act according to those judgments.

26. to know that language is not merely an instrument of expression and communication but actually an instrument of thought.

c) What affective changes are sought?

Teachers hesitate to use affective measures for evaluation partly because of the inadequacies of such techniques and largely because of a student's ability to detect and exploit those responses which receive reward. In effect, he/she says, "I'm supposed to appreciate this creed, and by God I'll say I do. That's the way the game goes." Meanwhile, "how sincere is he/she?" thumps in the teacher's temple. Such factors mustn't lead us to abandon this domain to others. We do so at our peril: chasing after metaphors could become the raison d'être for literary study, and everything in composition could be categorized by unity, coherence, emphasis, euphony, and economy. Frequently, in English, as in life, the most important aspects are difficult, if not impossible to measure. How do you accurately measure "the gleam in a student's eye?"; "excitement?"; "compassion?"; "respect?"; "sensitivity?"; "responsibility?"; "creativity?"; "interest?"; "co-operation?"; "awareness?"; "enjoyment?"; "values?"; "commitment?" Let no one doubt their importance. They are there.

Therefore, we seek to develop in all our student teachers the tendency:

1. to become more sensitive to human need.
2. to appreciate the place and contribution of "art" in man's life.
3. to respond with consistent and deep interest to intellectual stimuli.
4. to respond to human values and judgments as they are recorded in literature.
5. to search out voluntarily additional information related to their subject.
6. to become aware of the early recognition and treatment of problem adolescents.
7. to accept association with other human beings in groups.
8. to enjoy listening.
9. to value listening as civilizing and humanizing.
10. to listen carefully, courteously, and respectfully when others speak.
11. to be receptive and open-minded.
12. to value group process where members are competent and well informed; conversely, to question its value where members merely pool their opinion or ignorance.

13. to co-operate with members of various groups in which they hold membership.
14. to contribute to group discussion by asking thought-provoking questions and offering relevant information and ideas.
15. to assume some responsibility for drawing members of the group into conversation.
16. to value one's speaking experience as a means of self-expression and self-fulfillment.
17. to appreciate articulate speaking.
18. to derive satisfaction from writing imaginatively.
19. to enjoy reading for recreation.
20. to read voluntarily and widely to extend their experience and knowledge.
21. to appreciate the talent and skill of authors and other communicators.
22. to increase their desire to develop ability to speak and write effectively.
23. to examine deliberately a variety of viewpoints on controversial issues with a view to forming opinions about them.
24. to be ready to revise judgement and to change behaviour in the light of evidence.
25. to judge problems in terms of situations, issues, purposes, and consequences involved rather than in terms of fixed precepts.
26. to be committed to the discovery of truth, insofar as it can be discovered.
27. to cultivate a zest for thinking clearly and creatively.
28. to become more creative.

It is interesting to note that this description of goals is for a Type B course only; there was a separate detailed statement for the additional course that Type A students are required to take.

This listing of objectives may have been intended as a reflection of societal expectations of an English teacher rather than as a statement of what can be achieved in one year at a teacher training institution. Nevertheless, this list, while not representing a realistic set of attainable goals, does reveal to us at least the possible range of objectives from which each English instructor must necessarily select. And select he clearly must, given the severe time constraints of the Faculty of Education calendar.

The academic year in the Faculties, which corresponds roughly to that in the university, is reduced by at least eight weeks of practice teaching; as a result, there are effectively fewer than twenty weeks of teaching. Furthermore, the course load for student teachers is heavier than for undergraduates so that the amount of out-of-class preparation time the students have for each specific course is very limited.

As we have seen, at one institution, Type A students received eight hours a week of English instruction; even this eight hours is not enough when the scope of what must be covered is considered. At that same institution, however, Type B students received only four hours a week of English; and at other Faculties in the province, Type A and Type B students received only between three and four hours a week. Thus, most students graduating from Faculties of Education as teachers of English had received between 60 and 80 hours in total of class instruction in English.

Given the severity of these time constraints and given the potential scope of each course, much has to be excluded. What is excluded and included was determined on an individual basis by each instructor. Inevitably, the criteria for selection differed according to instructor, according to institution, and according to year; the courses thus varied widely across the province.

On the simplest level, there was a great variation in the amount of class time devoted to writing skills in general. On the Faculty Questionnaire, we asked each instructor of each course to estimate what percentage of time in that course (excluding practice teaching) was devoted to the methods and techniques for teaching a) expository writing, b) creative writing, c) grammar, other language study, and d) other subjects. The responses for those courses designed to train students to teach at the secondary level showed the following results: the figures for expository writing ranged from 8% to 30%, for creative writing from 0% to 50%, and for language study from 5% to 40%.

What this difference in emphasis suggests is a radical difference in philosophy, and this suggestion is borne out by an analysis of the content of the courses. First of all, there was a variation in the goals each instructor set for his course. As the tripartite division presented in the preceding outline of objectives suggests, each professor might give his primary emphasis to one of the following: developing certain skills within the student-teachers, presenting a body of knowledge to them, or seeking certain affective changes within them.

Two instructors, in particular, suggested that they direct most of their attention, insofar as their teaching of writing is concerned, not to presenting a clearly delineated methodology but rather to developing certain skills and attitudes within the student-teachers. Thus one of the two saw his goal in the first half of the year as primarily that of awakening his students from their passive roles as undergraduates to their roles as future teachers. In much the same way, he saw the teacher's major role in the high school classroom as that of stirring up his pupils' creative juices and motivating them to write.

The second instructor focused on language as the heart of the English curriculum. His goal, however, was not so much to provide his students with some carefully laid out methodologies as to change what he called his students' "mind-set," to alter their attitude about language rather than to increase their knowledge.

Other professors, however, focussed on the presentation of a body of knowledge, a set of principles, guidelines, or pedagogic techniques that could be used by the student-teachers in their future teaching experience. Here again, depending upon the institution and the instructor, there was a broad spectrum of principles espoused and approaches taken. In some cases, the differences reflected different emphases within a similar philosophy; in others, there were radically different attitudes towards, for example, the stage at which expository writing can be most profitably introduced into the school curriculum, the degree to which and the stage in the writing process at which teacher intervention is most beneficial, etc.

For example, in regard to the appropriate time for the introduction of expository writing, some Faculty of Education professors argued that pupils are ready for some kinds of exposition even at the grade four level. Many expressed the view that, although much of the writing in grades 7 - 10 should be descriptive and narrative, significant emphasis should be given in those years to expository writing and exercises relating to it and that, by grades 11 - 13, the bulk of the writing should be of this kind.

In contrast, at least one professor at a major institution argued that grade 7 - 10 pupils simply are not ready cognitively for the teaching of exposition; they have not arrived at the necessary sophistication of syntax especially, but also of vocabulary, logical thinking and rhetorical skills. His argument was that expository writing can be taught in such a way that effective mastery will persist only when other kinds of writing skills are already developed. In grades 7 - 10, therefore, the pupils should be encouraged to write in the descriptive and narrative modes - modes that are closely related to the kind of reading they are doing at that stage. Writing in these modes gives them occasion to expand their vocabulary in a meaningful way, to learn to use more complicated sentence structures and syntax, to practice relevant mechanical skills, and, all in all, to gain confidence in their handling of written language.

Of course, insofar as these skills are necessary to the writing of exposition as well, the descriptive and narrative writing of the earlier years can be seen as preparation for expository writing. However, actual writing in this mode in these years was seen as useless and even damaging in that it frustrates the pupils, weakens their confidence, and wastes the time and energy that would be better directed to cultivating other linguistic skills.

This divergence of views concerning the most appropriate timing for the introduction of expository writing within the school curriculum reveals certain fundamental differences not only concerning the development of writing and indeed cognitive abilities but perhaps more significantly concerning the focus of the teaching itself. Indeed, this divergence is symptomatic of a fundamental polarity in the attitudes towards the teaching of writing in general in the Faculties of Education and in much modern research and theory.

On the one hand, the focus is on the product - a well-written piece of exposition. Typically, the product will be analysed to discern those features which give it its characteristic unity and coherence, and, in the course of this analysis, certain rules are formulated to guide the students in their writing. At its crudest, this involves the prescription of a restricted topic sentence, to be developed in one of a limited number of clearly defined possible patterns, and to be followed by a neat conclusion. The content is assumed to be ready-made and easily fitted, by the accomplished writer, into the appropriate mould.

This approach to the teaching of exposition is typical of many handbooks on composition or rhetoric and typifies as well the methodology of a number of instructors at the Faculties of Education. It is a position which can also be formulated with greater sophistication and subtlety, however. One professor readily acknowledged the dualism underlying this position and argued the necessity for basing the teaching of composition on just such a dualism. Using Louis Milic's article, "Theories of Style and their Implications for the Teaching of Composition" as his text, he insisted to his students that every teacher of composition must have a theory of style. He outlined the three basic theoretic approaches: first, a view that style is the expression of personality; second, that style is inseparable from content; and third, that content exists "wordlessly" and can be expressed in a variety of forms.

The instructor's argument for the third position was not that it is necessarily true in an absolute sense but that it is the most useful for the teacher of composition. To be able to talk at all about the process of writing, one must assume this dualism.

It is precisely this analysis of his theoretical assumptions that was unusual about this professor's approach. He clearly identified his position with that of classical rhetoric, explicitly drawing on the particular formulas used in classical times to guide the writer or speaker while always relating these classical formulas to the contemporary situation with inventiveness and wit. He was able to subsume a good deal of modern linguistic theory within this classical framework, assimilating, for example, register theory to the classical concept of the persona of the speaker.

This represents one point of view - a position which focusses on the product, posits a rhetorical dualism, and provides the students with certain formulas to guide their writing. In contrast, other theorists insist that the writing process cannot be regulated in this way. Rather, they argue that in the act of composition the subject must find its own form and a student's creative flow must be encouraged and set into motion without any restrictions and self-conscious formulations that might impede its progress.

The emphasis of this approach is not on the product but on the process of composing. The teacher must activate the process, bringing to the surface the pupils' own unformulated thoughts and impressions, encouraging them to give their ideas some formulation in talking and subsequently a different formulation in writing. The teacher thus typically directs his attention to the prewriting stage. Once he has stimulated the discussion and brought the students' own critical and creative faculties into play, he must stand aside and allow them to develop their thoughts into a written piece according to their own rhythms. During the revising process, the teacher may once again take a more active role as a very supportive and tactful critic; he must take care, however, to help the students to develop their own critical powers rather than impose his own judgement on their work.

This latter position is consistent with the new attitude current in educational circles in the 60's and 70's in which the emphasis in the classroom has shifted from the teacher to the student. In other words, what has become important is not the act of teaching but the act of learning. According to this view, the traditional classroom was one in which the teacher was the centre of attention, doing most of the talking, asking only leading questions, and stagemanaging whatever discussion there was. Instead, it is argued, the teacher's efforts should be directed towards provoking genuine discovery on the part of the pupils and towards providing them with opportunities for learning on their own.

The new emphasis on the process of composing is obviously part of this same new orientation in education. Research has been directed at understanding the nature of the process, what actually happens when we write, and attention in the classroom has been focused on providing an environment designed to encourage and stimulate the pupils' own creativity.

A corollary of this student-centred approach is the insistence that the writing itself ought to be less teacher-oriented; writing is seen to have a personal value for the writer. Consequently the kind of writing that is encouraged is that kind which will have the most meaning to the writer at his or her stage of development.

Clearly the two approaches outlined above suggest contrasting views of the role of the teacher, the place of teacher intervention, and indeed the creative process itself. Both these views were represented in the classrooms and lecture halls of the Faculties of Education. This is not to say that the philosophical positions themselves were always set forward and argued. Only rarely were the theoretical premises themselves so examined. However, insofar as each of these positions implies very different methodologies, a particular professor's approach could generally be related to one of the two opposing views.

It should be added that there were some professors who aimed at some kind of synthesis. There were others who were completely eclectic in terms of methods and whose approaches revealed no consistent underlying philosophy. In other words, the polarity that characterizes the teaching of composition across the province was revealed in their own courses.

To sum up then, students trained in different institutions or even by different instructors in the same institution could leave the Faculties of Education with radically different approaches to the teaching of writing. What happens, then, when these teachers, each with different views of, say, when expository writing ought to be introduced, find themselves in the same high school dealing in successive years with the same group of pupils? Or what happens to the novice teacher, leaving the Faculty of Education with one point of view and its consequent methodology, who is confronted with a school or board curriculum whose approaches and methods are new to him?

The point, however, is not to legislate uniformity across all Faculties of Education. On the contrary. That would be as repellent in theory as it would be unrealistic in practice. What is important is that students be made aware of the possible diversity of approaches, that the theoretical assumptions and consequent practical implications of each theory be made explicit, and that the instructor's own biases be set forward honestly.

To this end, we recommend that English instructors in all the Faculties of Education meet together regularly in a professional forum specifically to discuss differences of approach, philosophy, and pedagogy. At this point, although Faculty of Education English professors may belong to such larger organizations as the Ontario Council of Teachers of English or the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, there is no organization specifically designed for English instructors in this province. Such an organization would not be so necessary if there were regular informal interchanges of views by faculty members; that, however, is clearly not the case. Hence the following recommendation.

Recommendation

> We recommend that representatives of the English departments of all the Faculties of Education meet together to draw up a common syllabus, defining at least the topics to be covered in an Intermediate-Senior English course.

It is hoped that, in the course of these discussions, the English instructors will be forced to articulate their own theoretic assumptions as well as come to terms with those of their colleagues.

1.31 Integration of Literature and Composition

In the preceding section, the diversity in methods of teaching composition suggested by different instructors in the Faculties of Education was traced to the very differing theoretical assumptions held, consciously or unconsciously, by various instructors. However, even where there was general acceptance of a principle by a majority of instructors, the practical implications and applications of the principle could still vary greatly. A case in point is the principle of integrating literature and composition in the school curriculum.

It was only in the 1960's that literature and composition were combined as one subject within the high school curriculum; until then, for many years, the two were taught as separate subjects. This change meant, first and foremost, a significant decrease in the time apportioned to English for each class. Integrating literature and composition became attractive to English teachers because it allowed them to use their limited time much more efficiently; the literature was used as an aid in teaching composition and the writing related directly to the literature. This integration was also in keeping philosophically with the view that increasingly found expression in the 60's and 70's that all the language arts are inseparable and that they ought to be taught in this way.

When we undertook our survey, there were still Faculty of Education professors who were not comfortable with this principle of integration. They argued that inevitably the teaching of writing suffers or that the teaching of literature becomes a search for easily imitated models; at the very least, they contended, writing skills must be taught as a separate block within the year's schedule. Nevertheless, the integration of literature and composition having been legislated by ministerial decree, most Faculty of Education professors - whatever their reservations - geared their teaching accordingly. This integration, however, had different meanings for different instructors.

For one professor, it meant writing essays about or as sequels to the literature studied. Other instructors used the literature studied as models for writing. For them, analysing literature was a prerequisite for good writing. They recommended that the literary works be analysed in order to discern those principles of organization and arrangement which their pupils would do well to emulate in their own writing.

In contrast, at least one professor insisted on a very different use of literary models. In his approach, instead of trying to follow the general principles suggested by a piece of literature, the student is encouraged to imitate the literary model as closely and precisely as possible; he must aim at reproducing its diction, style, tone, rhetoric, structure, sometimes even its substance.

This professor was concerned lest the literature studied give the students a mistaken impression of the creative process. Since we usually see a literary work only in its final form, what is not visible is the struggle, the sense of alternative possibilities, the choices that precede its completion. In order to create in his students this awareness of choice, he produced for them alternative versions of particular works.

Another point of view expressed very forcefully was that the interrelationship between literature and composition must be maintained within the classroom but that this integration does not involve an imitation of models nor a simple extraction of formulas. Instead the power of the study of literature lies in the dynamic and creative use of language evinced in the works studied; the force and energy thus displayed are themselves enough to ignite the students' own responses to language and hence their own creativity.

The variation in critical approaches described above is not as potentially damaging as that described in the previous section. A pupil in the school system taught in successive years by teachers trained in each of these different approaches may, in fact, be enriched by being exposed to these different methods. However, the differences may mean that the principle of integration itself ought perhaps to be reappraised. Certainly we did not hear with any frequency the argument that was heard invariably from the Language Arts instructors concerning the necessary and inextricable interrelationship of all the Language Arts. In high school, Language Arts has become English and reading has become literature, which not only involves the development of a skill but also constitutes a subject with its own clearly defined content. Moreover, even though high school English involves the development of certain skills, these are highly specialized skills, such as the critical reading of literary works and the writing of expository essays. The relationship between learning to read a play by Shakespeare critically and learning to write effectively in the expository mode is not so direct and apparent as that between reading and writing in the elementary curriculum.

Perhaps the reservations of some Faculty of Education professors concerning the principle of integration in general and the very different interpretations by the various instructors of this principle ought to prompt renewed discussion of the wisdom of enforcing such integration at the high school. This is certainly one topic that Faculty of Education English professors meeting together regularly should discuss.

It is also a topic that they should discuss with their colleagues, the Language Arts instructors. What has been very clear in our discussion of the Language Arts courses and the English courses at the Faculties is the difference in views not only among English instructors but also between English instructors and Language Arts instructors. Although there seemed to be, broadly speaking, a commonality of views among Language Arts instructors , their common point of view represented a different approach again, not coinciding exactly with any put forward in the English departments. Furthermore, if there seems to have been little interchange among English instructors in the Faculties of Education in the province, there has probably been even less between Language Arts professors and English professors, sometimes even within the same institution. Clearly, then, if our overall program in language, whether we call it English or Language Arts, is to have any coherence, there must be closer coordination and more discussion among instructors preparing students to teach at all of the levels.

Recommendation

> Therefore, we recommend further that Language Arts instructors meet with English instructors on a regular basis to explore and define their similarities and differences in goals, objectives, and approaches.

1.32 Language and Grammar

If the teaching of writing was characterized by a divergence of approaches, the teaching of grammar and language was marked by an even more radical divergence of views. In this case, the battlelines were more clearly drawn. The opposing arguments might not always have been understood; however, that there were opposing arguments, or, at least, that there were opponents, was readily acknowledged.

Furthermore, if the teaching of writing in the Language Arts courses seemed to be characterized by broad agreement on fundamental principles as opposed to the teaching of writing in the English courses, that distinction did not hold true for the teaching of language or grammar. Language arts instructors as well as English instructors disagreed fundamentally on the teaching of language.

First, there was strong disagreement as to the relationship between the teaching of language skills and writing skills. Certain instructors contended that a thorough grounding in traditional grammar is a prerequisite for writing well. These instructors asserted that this kind of training has been neglected in recent years and that this neglect is the cause of the decline in writing abilities; a return to the "basics" is what is needed.

In contrast, other instructors contended with equal conviction that this position has no basis in fact. They pointed to the series of studies which indicate that there is little or no relationship between a knowledge of the principles of grammar and the ability to write well. For them, grammar must be taught for other reasons, if it is to be taught at all.

Those who based this argument on the results of various research studies were seconded by several instructors who had taught school themselves for years and who explained that they had independently come to the same conclusions on the evidence of their own experiences in the classroom. In each case, they gave up the teaching of grammar in a systematic, structured way because they felt it had no payoffs in improved writing ability.

In fact, with a few notable exceptions, the view in the Faculties seemed to be that grammar should not be taught formally and systematically as a distinct segment. Instead, instructors urged that whatever teaching is to take place should be inductive, working from the pupils' own writing, pointing out specific mistakes specifically, rather than on theoretical grounds.

The particular framework underlying this inductive approach, however, was different for different instructors. Some argued strongly for a transformational grammar; others used a structural approach; others operated within the context of traditional grammar; a few drew eclectically but unsystematically on several different approaches; and yet others attempted to use no framework except for some generalized reference to levels of usage.

The basic split was between those who prefered traditional grammar and those versed in modern scientific grammar who argued that the traditional latinate description of our language is just not accurate. This polarity is not simply one that divides different factions; it often revealed itself within the attitudes and teaching of the same individual. For example, two instructors who felt strongly that traditional grammar is inaccurate and that its teaching has no effect on writing operated on very different principles when they conducted their own writing workshops; in each case, they gave their students a heavy dose of the familiar traditional material. One explained: "The students themselves request this and feel they benefit from it, as they frequently find themselves assigned 'grammar' in their practice teaching. I am myself rather doubtful about the value of formal grammar instruction as a means to improve writing ability, but the students seem sure about it and find themselves working with teachers who are totally convinced."

This statement indicates at least one source of the internal division felt by many instructors. Although they themselves may have had certain strong convictions about language teaching, they knew as well that their views were diametrically opposed to the views held by many school administrators, government officials, and members of the public at large. They felt conflicting obligations: on the one hand, to train their students in what they considered to be the most appropriate strategies as revealed by contemporary research and their own experience; on the other hand, to equip their students to function in the real world.

1.4 Undergraduate Preparation

Most students who received teacher training in Ontario were enrolled in consecutive rather than concurrent programs; in other words, they already had an undergraduate degree and were spending one year at a Faculty of Education or Teachers' College in order to receive their teaching certificate.

Consequently most of their post-secondary education had been completed by the time they entered the teacher training institution. One of our aims in this study was to discover the value of their undergradute education with respect to their future roles as teachers. To this end, all the English instructors, deans and principals of the various institutions were asked to give their assessment of their students and, by implication, of the training their students had had in certain areas. Specifically, they were asked to evaluate their incoming students' writing abilities as well as their knowledge of language studies that could be considered relevant to the teaching of composition (e.g. grammar, linguistic studies, etc.).

1.41 Writing Skills

The faculty questionnaires and the interviews both incorporated questions relating to the writing abilities of the student-teachers. We were concerned to know whether any tests were routinely administered to screen applicants, what kind of tests these were, and what the general consensus was concerning the students' writing abilities, based on their course work, exams, etc.

In 1976/77, only one institution used a formal test to screen students. All students seeking admission to this institution were asked to take a Language Competency Test which was intended to evaluate their ability in both written and oral English. Approximately 5% of those applying were excluded on this basis.

Two Faculties used less formal methods of appraising their students' writing abilities. As part of their pre-admission interview, students were asked to write a statement of intent or an autobiography focussing on the aspects of their lives which led toward teaching. Presumably the writing was assessed and the assesment was a factor in the decision to admit the student. In addition, at one institution, during orientation week, STEP tests in reading and English expression were administered to all students. On the basis of their scores, students who appeared to have language deficiencies were interviewed for further evidence to corroborate or refute the scores. When there was reason to doubt students' writing abilities, they were urged to participate in weekly workshops.

Generally speaking, however, the instructors' appraisals of their students' writing abilities were based on course work: exams, papers, reports. The evidence was thus fairly informal and the standards of evaluation varied with the individual instructor. This may, in part, account for the fact that the attitudes towards the student-teachers' writing competence were mixed, varying often even within the same institution. At least one instructor felt that the writing abilities of many students were grossly deficient. In contrast, a few instructors felt that the student-teachers' abilities were better than they had expected, better than the average undergraduate's, and almost always free of serious problems.

Several professors made the point repeatedly that there was no real evidence of a decline in the level of literacy. However, as it turned out, this was more a comment on the general hue and cry about literary rather than an expression of satisfaction with their students' competence. As one instructor explained, in a class of some 25 Type A students, each of whom had had at least a B average in 10-13 English courses, four could be considered "sub-literate." This proportion, however, had not changed over the years.

Thus the responses to the direct question concerning the writing abilities of incoming student-teachers showed no clear consensus among the faculty members polled. There were, however, other revealing indications. For example, instructors in at least four institutions were offering remedial help to their students on some basis. In some cases, this involved one-to-one tutoring with the student. In other cases, more formal writing workshops had been set up, sometimes as credit courses. Yet other institutions were considering the introduction of a course on expository writing.

In addition, when asked to make recommendations concerning possible improvement in undergraduate programs, a large number advocated some kind of compulsory course in writing. Some urged that this be a course specifically in expository writing, "a course which would insure that they [could] write clear, coherent, convincing English." Others argued that English majors, especially, had already had enough practice writing expository essays; they need to experience writing in other modes. But there was fundamental agreement that more writing at the undergraduate level was desirable.

It is interesting to note in this context the 1961 study done by the National Council of Teachers of English on teacher preparation. As part of the project, teachers were asked to indicate courses in English and in the teaching of English which are of most benefit and value to future teachers. Almost all the teachers ranked intermediate or advanced composition as their first choice.

In addition to this kind of formal course, many Faculty of Education instructors urged that undergraduates be asked to do more writing and that this writing receive more careful professorial attention in all courses. They expressed concern that too many courses require no papers and only multiple-choice exams. They pointed as well to undergraduate papers they had seen which bore little trace of any careful evaluation or careful scrutiny.

Quite clearly, then, they placed direct responsibility for their students' weaknesses on the universities. One professor's comment was typical. In response to the question as to whether tests were administered to screen applicants, the reply was: "Not since a university degree became a requirement."

1.42 Rhetoric

A related concern expressed by several faculty members was that their students, whatever their writing abilities, came to them with no background in, or understanding of, rhetoric or the theory of writing. "Most students have no background in rhetoric, semantics, or composition, nor in anything but literature."

The feeling was strong, especially among those instructors who taught courses for secondary school English teachers, that a knowledge of the theory and philosophy of rhetoric is an essential component of the student-teacher's training. At the same time, they felt that they themselves simply did not have the time to provide this background.

1.43 Language Skills

Instructors at the Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges were also asked to appraise their students' background in language studies. The view held by the overwhelming majority of instructors was that their entering students were weak in this area. One of the few professors who felt that the students' knowledge was "adequate" qualified even this faint praise by explaining that they were "rather weak", however, in "understanding the reasons for correct grammatical structures."

During the interviews many complained bitterly that they had to spend much of their very limited time attempting to fill in the gaps in their students' knowledge. The entire situation was considered highly unsatisfactory since, on the one hand, they were aware that the necessary background could not be acquired in such short order, yet, on the other hand, they felt that the pedagogic techniques for teaching this material could not be given without some real knowledge. One professor explained: "One difficulty is that students need more background information on the nature of grammar, language, symbolism, modes and registers as well as some experience with students at various age and ability levels - and fresh university graduates have little of either. Even if we could spend double the time on composition the results with student-teachers would not increase substantially, since at some point background and experience are absolutely necessary to progress."

When asked specifically what changes they would recommend at the undergraduate level in order the better to prepare student teachers, or what undergraduate courses they would recommend, the professors' comments were revealing. The majority felt that future teachers at all levels should have undertaken some academic study of language. Almost all clarified this so as to exclude the kinds of courses most commonly offered in English Departments under the rubric of "language": they did not mean that students should be required to take courses in such subjects as Old and Middle English and Old Norse, and several also excluded the kind of History of the English Language courses that are commonly offered in English Departments. Instead, a few instructors specifically suggested the kind of courses which such authorities as Gleason have long advocated: an introduction to linguistics, a course in the structures of Modern English; most of these people also recommended courses in psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. However a majority of those who recommended some kind of language training other than what has been traditional were rather more guarded in their recommendations, and their comments suggested that they had some doubts about the effectiveness of the kinds of introductory courses in linguistics and structures of English courses which are commonly offered in Linguistics Departments: the feeling seemed to be that such courses are usually too specific and too theoretical to provide future teachers with the kind of knowledge and appreciation that the Faculties would like them to have of the working of language in general and of the working of English specifically. Thus one instructor suggested that an introductory course in linguistics would be a useful prerequisite, so long as it was not offered in a Linguistics Department. On the other hand, one professor suggested that a course in Children's literature as it might be taught in a Linguistics Department - presumably by a psycholinguist - would be a relevant prerequisite. Generally, then, most instructors would like their students to have a great deal more training in language, but they would prefer that such training be available in less specialized and less technical courses developed specifically for teachers and other generalists, courses "revealing the richness and complexity of human language," but at a level still within the reach of a typical English major.

The difficulty they pointed to was that few Ontario universities offer such courses. One professor assessed the situation in Ontario as follows. "What I would prefer to see is a wider conception of what a degree in English is, wider certainly than English specialists are currently encouraged to hold at the undergraduate level. When I was an undergraduate . . . in the early 60's I was said to be enrolled in English Language and Literature. The title was a misnomer which passed by virtue of a cursory glance at the history of the language and enough Old English to read a parable or two and a snatch of poetry. Even now it is true that a degree in English means a degree in Literature read in English. . . . My English specialists enter the Faculty seeing themselves as teachers of literature to younger versions of themselves, by and large, and they soon find themselves having to readjust that view. . . It would be helpful if undergraduate departments expanded their programs in the language side of the curriculum."

The complaints expressed by the Faculty of Education professors are consistent with the criticisms leveled generally in the literature on teacher education in Ontario and abroad. Thus, for example, in an address to the Ontario Council of Teachers of English, H.A. Gleason (1976) said: "The present deficiency is much more profoundly in understanding - what education is directed toward - than in skills - what training attempts to build. And that means that our concern must be directed toward the university rather than the teachers' college. For the facts are that our allegedly 'properly prepared' English teachers have been seriously shortchanged in their university years. They should there have built a profound understanding and detailed knowledge of the English language on the basis of a sound general knowledge and understanding brought with them from high school. Instead, they come with little or nothing and have nothing systematic added. They pass on to teachers' college to learn a few skills which, because they have no undergirding, inevitably degenerate into gimmicks."

In 1968, in a study of teacher preparation in universities of Western Canada Joel Gajadharsingh made a similar point. Using the standards for pre-service teacher education set by the National Council of Teachers of English and the standard proposed by the Commission on English, he found that the pre-service education in the seven Western Canadian universities did not measure up. Concerning their training in language, he wrote: "The inadequate training provided for the teacher of English in linguistics is clearly illustrated. Only three of the seven institutions responding require the English teacher to take such a course." In Ontario, no institution makes such a requirement.

Furthermore, in his analysis of the course requirements in composition and rhetoric, Gajadharsingh found that the institutions were similarly lacking when compared to the N.C.T.E. and Commission on English standards. It is worthwhile looking at the N.C.T.E. statement on teacher preparation since it reflects so exactly the views expressed by so many of the English and Language Arts instructors.

> The program in English for the elementary school teacher should provide a balanced study of language, literature, and composition above the level of freshman English.
>
> The program in English for the secondary school teacher of English should constitute a major so arranged as to provide a balanced study of language, literature, and composition above the level of freshman English.
>
> [The teacher of English at any level]
>
> C. should have a well-balanced descriptive and historical knowledge of the English language.
>
> 1. He should have some understanding of phonology, morphology, and syntax; the sources and development of the English vocabulary; semantics; and social, regional, and functional varieties of English usage.
> 2. He should be acquainted with methods of preparation and uses of dictionaries and grammars.
> 3. He should be well-grounded in one grammatical system and have a working acquaintance with at least one other system.
> 4. He should have studied basic principles of language learning in order to apply his knowledge at various grade levels to the problems of those learning to speak, listen, read, and write to a variety of audiences.
> 5. He should have an understanding of the respective domains of linguistics and rhetoric, and of the range of choice available within the structure of the language.
>
> D. He should be able to utilize his knowledge of language and of language learning to develop his own and his students' ability to read and to listen. His knowledge should include an understanding of the components of reading and listening processes and of the variety of ways in which people read and listen.

E. He should have acquired a functional understanding of the nature and substance of rhetoric.

1. He should have some acquaintance with the principles of classical rhetoric, and should understand their relationship to modern rhetorics.
2. He should have some acquaintance with the influence of rhetorical theory on the teaching of composition.
3. He should have sufficient acquaintance with the principles of rhetoric and the nature of the writing process to be able to use the former, where relevant, in analyzing the latter or products thereof, whether written or oral.
4. He should have sufficient acquaintance with the principles of rhetoric, as related to the writing process, to be able to use them, where relevant, in his own writing and speaking, and also in his teaching.

The kind of knowledge outlined in this N.C.T.E. statement is precisely what so many of the instructors found lacking in their entering students. They did not, however, unanimously argue for prerequisites in order to make up for these shortcomings. One dean in particular was leery of prerequisites or "paper solutions," on the grounds that, first, instruction in different institutions could not be controlled and, second, that brilliant intuitive teachers might thereby be excluded.

However, there certainly was a widespread belief that the necessary knowledge was lacking and that something would have to be done to remedy the situation. There was an accompanying feeling that the market could bear much more stringent entrance requirements.

In view of the criticisms leveled by Faculty of Education professors at their students' undergraduate training and in view of the requirements for teachers of English made in other jurisdictions and articulated by professional bodies of English teachers, we recommend that measures be taken to ensure that intending English or Language Arts teachers be given training in writing skills, in the theory of rhetoric and composition, and in the study of language in addition to any courses on the teaching of English or Language Arts that they receive as part of their education program.

Recommendation

All students entering Faculties of Education
as Language Arts or English specialists
should have the following prerequisites:

1. a course in writing and theories of rhetoric;
2. a course in language designed for teachers (or generalists).

Recommendation

All students enrolled in the concurrent program as elementary or English specialists should take the following courses:

1. a course in writing and theories of rhetoric;
2. a course in language designed for teachers (or generalists).

1.5 Practice Teaching

Every student enrolled in a Faculty of Education program had to spend some time practice teaching. The length of time devoted to the practicum varied according to institution from a minimum of eight weeks to a maximum of twelve weeks for the consecutive program. The following table gives a comparative breakdown of the time allotment to practice teaching in the various institutions.

INSTITUTION	TIME SPENT PRACTICE TEACHING
A	10 weeks
B	8 weeks minimum - 11 weeks maximum
C	10 weeks
D	12 weeks
E	12 weeks
F	9 weeks
G	8 weeks
H	8 weeks
I	10 weeks
J	9 weeks

These figures represent only the time that the students were assigned to classrooms as student-teachers. In addition, they may have spent some time observing in the schools. Unlike the practicum, however, this observation was not a constant component of all Faculty of Education programs and, when it was featured, it could take very different forms. One institution scheduled a one-week observation period in the schools at the beginning of the academic year. At a second Faculty, students spent one day a week observing over five successive weeks; yet a third Faculty scheduled one day a week for a total of fourteen weeks.

The practice teaching was more uniform in structure for the consecutive programs in all institutions, although, as the preceding table indicates, the actual time allotted varied by as much as 50%. Generally, the practicum was broken up into two-week blocks of time; occasionally there was a four-week block and one institution had, in addition to its three blocks of two weeks each, three blocks of one week each.

For each block of time, students were assigned to a specific host or associate teacher in the school system. That teacher was responsible for supervising, directing, and evaluating the student-teacher over the entire time period. A faculty member appointed by the Faculty of Education did some evaluating and advising as well. It is clear that the major share of the responsibility, however, belonged to the associate teacher, for a number of reasons. Each faculty member had fifteen to thirty students to supervise, and the students were assigned to different schools and frequently to different boards. Consequently, the time the faculty adviser could devote to each student-teacher over a two-week block of time was not great. Moreover, the faculty supervisors proved loath to interfere with the host teacher's program of studies and classroom routine. More than professional etiquette is involved here; there are political considerations as well. As one instructor explained, "the practicum . . . operates by the grace and favour of the cooperating boards, schools, principals, and teachers"; faculty members could not risk jeopardizing this rather delicate arrangement.

There was a further limitation on possible input from faculty advisers for elementary teachers. For secondary student-teachers, the faculty adviser is a specialist in the subject that the student-teacher is teaching; for the elementary student-teachers, where the student is expected to teach everything in the curriculum, that is obviously not possible. The instructor assigned to the student-teacher may have been a mathematics specialist or an educational foundations instructor while the lesson observed may have been in Language Arts.

For all these reasons, the associates bore prime responsibility for guiding the development of the student-teacher during the practice-teaching. The selection process for these associates is then of some significance. Usually, they were selected as follows: principals from each school would compile a list of teachers they deemed appropriate and pass this list on to the board superintendent. The superintendent might then choose from among the names presented to him by the various principals; he would then send the list along to the Faculty of Education. The Faculty might screen once again; this screening, which was generally informal, was based on the appraisal of faculty supervisors and sometimes on feedback from former students. The pruning, however, could not be excessive, for the needs were great: one institution alone used some two thousand associates. Moreover, there was a variation according to the subject of specialization as well; as one dean explained, in some disciplines such as "Man and Society" there were so few teachers, and in others, such as English, the needs were so great, that pruning was hardly an option. In effect, the Faculties had relatively little direct input into the choice of associate teachers.

On the Faculty Questionnaire, and during the interviews, we pursued the further question of how much control the Faculties had over what goes on in the classroom. For example, could they stipulate that the student-teacher be given an opportunity to teach composition? Nearly all instructors and deans replied that the institutions can and do exert only a minimal control over what goes on in the practicum. They could dictate the minimum number of lessons to be taught and the maximum amount of time to be spent teaching - and not much else. Many expressed concern about the consequent lack of coherence between the practicum and the academic program. There was no assurance, for example, that student-teachers would be given opportunities to teach certain subjects such as language and composition or that the teaching methods recommended at the faculty would be tried in the classroom or, in general, that the teaching in the Faculties of Education would be reinforced in any way, in the schools.

Some institutions tried to remedy the situation by developing closer ties with the associates. One Faculty conducted weekend workshops for associates where faculty members tried to explain what they were doing at the university. Another offered a course specifically designed for associates. However, the problem evidently goes deeper, relating to the very structure of the practicum. As one instructor explained, "the student-teacher . . . is expected to contribute to the program established by the school. The associate's prime responsibility is at all times to his own students, and it is the student-teacher's job to fit into a sequence of learning set in motion before he arrives and carrying on after he leaves."

There were several other general criticisms of the present system of practice teaching made by Faculty of Education personnel. One instructor argued that the practicum, as it is now constituted, is far too short for the student-teacher really to learn anything worthwhile. No sooner have the students reached a stage in the practicum where they are ready to grapple with a problem they have encountered than they have to come back to the Faculty. For these and other reasons, several instructors expressed to us their interest in alternative practice teaching structures, especially one-year internships of different kinds.

A few Ontario institutions have already introduced or experimented with alternative structures for practice teaching. For example, one Faculty, which has only a consecutive program, was developing an alternative practice-teaching scheme that would fit into the regular one-year structure. Instead of the conventional assignment to a school, students participating in this program would receive an assignment to a practice teaching centre where, ideally, student-teachers, teachers, and faculty members would all have input into the conduct of classes. This option, however, was to be available to only a select number of the institution's many students.

A different kind of structure was offered by one institution with a concurrent rather than a consecutive program. According to this model, for each of the three years that students are enrolled in the B. Ed. program, they were assigned to a specific school for the duration of that year. At that school, one teacher, called an "adjunct professor", was made responsible for a section of up to fifteen students. The adjunct professor spent half a day a week in a seminar with the students together with a member of the faculty. In addition, students spent one day a week in the school under the guidance of the adjunct professor; then at the end of the academic year, they were assigned to that same school for their practice teaching.

The aim of this model was to develop an organic relationship between the Faculty and the schools to their mutual benefit and to the benefit of the student-teachers; to give the students a realistic sense of the progress of a class over the entire school year; and to lessen some of the artificiality and pressure of the practice-teaching situation.

Such a model, however, is very costly in time as well as in resources. To achieve its potential, the program must be carefully monitored and closely supervised; its success is dependent on the maintenance of a creative and harmonious relationship between the Faculty and the school. For this reason, the dean of another Faculty of Education argued that to succeed such a program must be kept small. Indeed the number of students enrolled in this program was relatively small, 269 in 1975/76 as compared to 815, 1172, and 1906 in the three major institutions.

The alternative programs outlined above are interesting; however the majority of Ontario's teacher education students were not involved in any of these programs. Rather, their practicum was constituted along the lines described initially. Insofar as the educational system as a whole is affected by the experience of the student-teachers, it is that kind of practice-teaching that has had the greatest impact.

What actually goes on during this practice teaching was difficult to ascertain on the basis of our interviews and the reports from faculty members. It became very clear that the Faculties of Education actually had very little control over that crucial part of the teacher education program. In reality, the practicum was normally not an extension of the Faculty of Education program, but a thing apart. If the Faculties wish to achieve a coherent, consistent, and mutually enriching relationship between the practicum and the theoretical component of the program, they must give serious thought to some major restructuring.

THE STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY

2.1 Introduction

The Student Teacher Survey was the second of the three formal surveys undertaken. As we noted in our proposal, we expected that in some respects a survey of current student teachers would allow us to form a more accurate idea than the Survey of Practising Teachers could convey of current practices in the Faculties of Education and Teacher Education Colleges, especially in relation to such matters as the amount of time devoted to various parts of the curriculum and the kind of stress placed on them. In addition, we noted that a survey designed to include respondents from areas other than the secondary-English area with which we were most concerned would provide us with potentially important supplementary data concerning the improvement of the teaching of writing in schools, since a great deal of the writing in schools takes place outside of English classes. We thought also that we would be able to gather from the student body some information concerning views of the amount of attention given to their own writing during their teacher training. Such information was specifically mentioned in among the research questions for this study. Finally, we wanted to learn what the student teachers had perceived of what they were being taught.

For reasons which are to be discussed more fully within, the data elicited by the Student Teacher Survey probably sometimes represent students' perceptions and memories and even, on occasion, vague estimates, rather than their actual experience. Nevertheless these data make a valuable contribution to our study. This is particularly the case in those parts of the questionnaire which dealt with practice teaching and observation: for these areas, the Student Teacher Survey gave us our only up-to-date information. In addition, the Survey provided us with extensive information about the undergraduate training of the student body as a whole, and especially that part of it with which we were most concerned, those prospective English specialists with degrees in English language and literature. It showed us something of their attitudes to their future profession, especially in relation to writing abilities. And it gave us important insights into what the academic background of future English teachers had been, and what had been added to it during the year of their teacher training.

2.11 Procedures

2.111 The Questionnaire

A copy of the questionnaire used for the Student Survey is included as Appendix II. It was designed to elicit the demographic information normal in any sociological survey. In addition, it requested information about the previous education of the respondents, including their undergraduate training, and more detailed information about the courses in which they were enrolled during their teacher training. Further sections asked for detailed information about specialized courses in English and Language Arts and in the teaching of composition. A section also asked students to identify the position most nearly corresponding to their own on such topics as the responsibility for teaching writing, the importance of grammar, of spelling and punctuation, and the relative importance of literacy in the modern world. In addition, the questionnaire sought detailed information on what the students had done in their practice teaching, and specifically whether or not they had been able to observe classes in the teaching of writing or to conduct such classes themselves -- information which could be obtained in no other way since (as we noted in the report on the Faculty Survey) the Faculties have very little control over what their students do during their practice teaching. Because of the very short time available, this questionnaire had to be designed in great haste.

2.112 The Sample

On the advice of the sociological consultant for this part of the project, a stratified sample of the student teachers was selected, with variable sample ratios within strata. The population to be sampled was to include all student teachers whose training, under the system then in force, was preparing them to teach at the grade 7 level or above. Where the information provided to us by the Faculties was not such that we could exclude from the population student teachers enrolled in E.S.T.4 programs and specializing at the primary and junior levels, the population to be sampled included all student teachers. Thus the sample design allowed us to sample all secondary teachers, since all have some responsibility for the writing abilities of their students, and since many people who did not specialize in Type A or Type B English courses at a Faculty of Education are nevertheless assigned to English classes during their careers. In addition, the sample design allowed us to sample all prospective teachers at the grade 7 and 8 levels. Finally, we had no choice but to include students enrolled in Primary-Junior programs in institutions other than the Teacher Education Colleges because their institutions were not able to provide us with information which would have made it possible for us to exclude them. As will be seen from Table 2.3 (within), these students amounted to 26.9% of the respondents. Their inclusion in the analysis is justified: the Certificate which they were to be awarded (E.S.T.4) entitled them to teach at any level up to grade 10.

Although the overall sample was to approximate 10% of the total population, an increase in the sampling size was permitted where the total population of a particular institution was small. In addition, where possible, the sample was stratified to distinguish secondary students or English specialists from the whole population, with an increase in the sampling size for this key target population. In the case of the Faculty of Education of the University of Toronto, although we were provided with information which would have enabled us to stratify on the basis of whether or not students were enrolled in Type A and B English programs, the size of the population was such that we considered this stratification unnecessary. On the other hand, in the case of Althouse College and McArthur College, stratification would have been desirable, but the information provided by these institutions was such that it could not be effected. The population was stratified at Brock, where the secondary students could be identified because of their membership in the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation; at York, which provided us with records distinguishing secondary from other students; and at Lakehead, which identified English specialists for us. The total stratum size (N), the sampling ratio used and the expected sample size are shown in Table 2.1.

2.113 Administration of the Questionnaires

Wherever possible, the questionnaires were administered in person. At Lakehead, York, Queen's, Nipissing, Toronto OTEC, Hamilton OTEC, Ottawa and Windsor, this was done between March 29 and April 29, 1977. For various reasons it was not possible to administer the questionnaires in person to the student sample in Toronto, Western Ontario, Windsor and Trent. In all these cases

Table 2.1

STRATIFICATION, STRATUM SIZE AND SAMPLING RATIO FOR THE SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Stratum	Total size of stratum	Sampling ratio	Expected sample size
0. Toronto	1519	10%	154
1. Brock 1 (OSSTF)	42	50%	21
2 (Other)	230	20%	48
2. York 1 (Secondary)	32	100%	32
2 (Other)	89	33 1/3%	30
3. Queen's	914	10%	91
4. Lakehead 1 (English)	12	100%	12
2 (Other)	246	33 1/3%	82
5. Ottawa	161	33 1/3%	53
6. Western	1053	10%	105
7. Windsor	398	20%	79
8. Nipissing	199	33 1/3%	66
9. OTEC Toronto	737	10%	73
10. OTEC Hamilton	399	20%	79
11. Trent	15	100%	15

the questionnaire was administered by mail. When, for any stratum, the first attempted enumeration was unsuccessful in eliciting responses from all the students in the sample, a second copy of the questionnaire was mailed to them, and if this still did not elicit a response, a third mailing followed during the summer. In addition, non-respondents at Queen's, Toronto and Western Ontario were contacted by telephone in a further attempt to ensure an adequate response rate. The final number of responses is given in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2

RESPONSE RATE FOR THE SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Stratum		N_i	n_i	
0.	Toronto	1519	103	
1.	Brock 1	42	12	35
	2	230	23	
2.	York 1	32	21	46
	2	89	25	
3.	Queen's	914	61	
4.	Lakehead 1	12	8	63
	2	246	55	
5.	Ottawa	161	40	
6.	Western Ontario	1053	70	
7.	Windsor	398	36	
8.	Nipissing	199	39	
9.	OTEC Toronto	737	55	
10.	OTEC Hamilton	399	64	
11.	Trent	15	15	
	Totals	6046	627	

After coding and key-punching, the data from the questionnaires were stored on computer in an SPSS system file. Weights were then added on the basis of the formula:

$$W_{ij} = \frac{N_i \sum n_i}{n_i \sum N_i}$$

where

W_{ij} is the weight applied to any case in stratum i.

It will be clear, incidentally, that the standard error calculated by the SPSS program (i.e. using the formula $SE=S/\sqrt{n}$) is actually too large, given the design. In cases where the difference seemed likely to be important the standard error was recalculated according to the more appropriate formula:

$$SE = \left\{ \sum \left[\left(\frac{N_i}{\sum N_i}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{n_i}{N_i}\right) \left(\frac{S_i^2}{n_i}\right) \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where

S_i is the standard deviation for stratum i, the standard deviation being calculated on the basis of the unweighted formula for this purpose.

2.12 Problems in the Data

The paramount problem in the interpretation of the results of the Student Teacher Survey has already been alluded to in the introduction to this chapter: the questionnaire seemed to be seeking factual data, but on many questions could only elicit attitudinal data. Clearly we have no way of determining whether or not particular respondents who claimed that expository writing was accorded a great deal of importance in their training were describing what they had actually experienced. Rather we know only that they thought that writing was accorded a great deal of importance, or claimed that it was.

Moreover the sets of questions relating to the students' views of what they had been taught resemble to some extent the kinds of questions to be found on a teacher-evaluation questionnaire. Although we tried to minimize this impression, it was probably impossible to preclude it entirely. In addition, owing to the unexpectedly late date at which the contract for this project was awarded, the questionnaire had to be administered very late in the academic year, at a time when many students were face to face with the realization that they were not likely to be able to get a job in their chosen field. For many, the bitterness of this realization may have combined with the feeling (a feeling apparently common at the end of a year of teacher training throughout the world, no matter what the discipline) that the content of the year had proved somehow different from what they had hoped it would be, and somehow less than the last years of their university education had been. In combination with these, the tendency to use the questionnaire as an occasion to express unfavourable feelings about their teacher training was certainly dominant in the case of some respondents, to the point of vindictiveness. Even where it was not so clearly discernible in the comments on the questionnaires, it may have coloured the responses of some of the students surveyed. In general, however, the problems inherent in attitudinal data are clear; the only potential danger is in the interpretation of the results. Where the data are attitudinal, this should always be clear from the discussion.

There is another problem, however, concerning the response rate. As has already been mentioned, the design for the Survey allowed for a stratified sample with variable sample ratios within strata, so that we could discuss the characteristics of the student population as a whole, and also make valid assertions about smaller subpopulations. Unfortunately it proved impossible to stratify for secondary versus non-secondary in two of the three institutions primarily responsible for the training of secondary teachers, namely Queen's and Western Ontario, because the relevant information was not made available to us. Partly for this reason, and partly for what at other institutions might be described as a reluctance to facilitate our work, the response rate from prospective secondary English specialists was lower than desired. For some questions, the response rate was so low that the resulting estimates cannot be accorded any reliability. In such cases, however, what is usually significant is not that the proportions were what they proved to be among those who could answer the question, but rather that the number of valid cases was so low. Where this point is relevant, it too should be clear from the discussion of the results.

2.2 Results: The Student Teacher Population as a Whole

During the 1976-77 academic year, the majority of the students in the population sampled in teacher training institutions in Ontario were aged between 22 and 25 (72.1%). Women outnumbered men by two to one. 73.1% of the student teachers were born in Ontario, with a further 9.6% born elsewhere in Canada and the remaining 8.2% abroad. An even higher percentage, 89.2%, received most of their elementary education in Ontario, and for their secondary education the corresponding proportion rises to 91.8%. 92.7% of them received their undergraduate training in Ontario. The estimates by institution are as follows:

University of Ottawa	1.6%
University of Toronto	10.5%
Carleton University	5.7%
Western Ontario	11.7%
McMaster University	9.5%
York University	10.2%
Queen's University	6.7%
University of Windsor	7.1%
University of Waterloo	6.0%
Lakehead University	2.6%
Laurentian University	2.6%
Sir Wilfrid Laurier University	4.0%
University of Guelph	9.0%
Brock University	2.9%
Trent University	2.6%
Other Canadian	2.5%
Other and missing	4.8%

Only 3.6% of the total population had a higher qualification than an honours Bachelor's degree, while a mere 2.3% had a lower qualification than a Bachelor's degree. A majority (52.7%) had a pass Bachelor's degree as their highest academic qualification, while 40.8% had an honours Bachelor's degree.

The largest group of the respondents surveyed was that enrolled in EST 4 certificate programs and specializing in the Primary-Junior levels. These were followed closely by High School Assistant Type A students and EST 4 students specializing in the Junior-Intermediate grades. The breakdown for the sampled population is given in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3

PERCENTAGE ENROLMENTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 1976-77

High School Assistant Type A	24.1%
High School Assistant Type B	7.3%
Combined K-13	10.9%
EST 4, Primary-Junior	26.9%
EST 4, Junior-Intermediate	20.4%
EST 4, Primary-Intermediate	8.3%
Vocational Certificate, A	0 %
Vocational Certificate, B	0.7%
Occupational Certificate, B	1.0%

2.3 7-13 Student Teachers

Of all the students in the population surveyed, 72.7% were enrolled in programs specializing in teaching at the 7-13 level, with students in High School Assistant A group forming the largest single component, closely followed by students enrolled in E.S.T.4

programs specializing at the Junior-Intermediate level. The remaining groups, in descending order of size, were the Combined K-13, the E.S.T.4 Primary-Intermediate, the High School Assistant B, and Vocational and Occupational. The number of students whose highest academic qualification was a pass Bachelor's degree dropped from 52.7% for the whole population sampled to 45% for the 7-13 group. The number having an honours degree increased from 40.8% to 48.6%, and the number having a Master's degree increased from 2.9% of the surveyed population to 3.8% of the 7-13 group. Among this group, however, the proportion having either English or English and another subject as their undergraduate major actually dropped slightly from 18.6% of the surveyed population to 17.6% of the 7-13 group. The number who included some English courses in their undergraduate degree remained virtually unchanged.

2.31 Preparation in Language and Composition

The English courses which the student teachers in the 7-13 category had taken as part of their degree were not the kind of English language courses desiderated by the Faculty members interviewed in the Faculty survey, nor the potentially more relevant linguistically oriented courses mentioned in the questionnaire, nor even the "language" courses traditionally offered by English Departments. In the 7-13 domain, only 6.1% of the student teachers had taken a course in the history of the English language, 5.1% a course in the structure of modern English, and a mere 2.4% a course in grammatical theories. The number who had taken a course in composition and rhetoric was only slightly better than the last at 4.2%. Clearly the overwhelming majority of this group of students had not been exposed to any kind of intensive study of language and rhetoric on which their instructors in the Faculties of Education could build. The claim that the undergraduate preparation of incoming students is seriously lacking seems to be fully justified in these results.

As to the effect of their experience in teacher training institutions, the evidence provided by the student questionnaires is similarly disquieting, although this is more a comment on the students' capacity to learn so much and change so fundamentally in so short a time than a reflection on the nature of the instruction they received. To be sure, the responses to the questions dealing with instruction in grammar and language during teacher training may sometimes have been coloured by the respondents' wishes to give us what they thought we wanted rather than what they thought had happened. This is clearly the case, for example, in the claim made by approximately 10% of the students at Queen's that they had studied systemic grammar, a system of grammatical analysis which, to the best of our knowledge, was not discussed in any of the Language Arts and English courses given at Queen's. Nonetheless, the responses as a whole suggest that some instruction in language and composition was given at the Faculty of Education level.

Thus, 19.4% of this group of students (compared to 20.8% of the population) claimed that they had had some introduction to sociolinguistics in the course of their teacher training, 42.6%

claimed that they had had an introduction to structural grammar and 18.3% claimed that they had had an introduction to transformational grammar; in addition 29.2% claimed that they had had some introduction to semantics. On the other hand, 50.8% claimed that they had taken traditional grammar in the course of their teacher training. Even if this figure is high, for the reasons given above, nonetheless the proportions between the results for the different types of grammatical analysis listed on the questionnaire appear likely to be valid.

Each of the non-traditional systems of linguistic analysis is complex. Someone who has never studied them before is likely to need a considerable amount of time even to come to terms with their approach, let alone acquire some understanding of how they work. In view of the number of other things incorporated into teacher training, the percentages cited above could hardly be meaningful even if they did reflect what the students were taught during their teacher training: at best, the students could only have learned that such systems of grammatical analysis exist, and that their instructors may have thought that they could be of some interest or usefulness to future teachers of grade 7-13 students. For most students, that is not likely to have been sufficiently forceful to have changed the attitudes acquired during the whole of their earlier education. Moreover even the possibility of any change is reduced because of the number of Faculty members who, either because of their own faith in traditional grammar, or because of their rueful recognition of others' faith in it, continue to stress traditional grammar: as noted, 50.8% of the respondents claimed that they had taken traditional grammar in the course of their teacher training.

As has already been noted, more than one of the faculty members we interviewed suggested that, when student teachers come to teach, they have in most cases little choice but to fall back on the models of teaching with which they are most familiar, the models their own earlier education has provided them. Against the force of these models, the hurried and therefore necessarily superficial discussion of the problems in traditional grammar (where they were discussed at all) and the possible strengths of other systems of grammar could avail little at best, and in view of the wholehearted support of traditional grammar among some faculty members, and the widespread ambivalence about it among more, could avail even less.

For this reason the respondents' evaluation of their earlier training in writing is revealing, especially when it is calibrated with their attitudes as these were revealed in the questions pertaining to aspects of literacy. Almost 80% of the respondents claimed that the quality of their training in expository writing at the high school level had been good, fair or excellent. In their evaluation of their training at the undergraduate level, the percentage evaluating their training in writing as fair, good or excellent dropped strikingly to 64%, but this is still a very favourable evaluation. Even in their comments on the quality of the attention paid to mechanical skills in their undergraduate careers, 55.5% of the respondents rated their earlier training as fair, good or excellent. Clearly, in view of the earlier discussion of the courses they had taken, these figures do not reflect specialized courses in composition. They refer to the students' impressions of the whole of their high school and undergraduate careers, and must mean that they consider that the experience of having had to write expository essays was for them one of the most impressive parts of their own preparation to teach writing. The drop in the percentage of favourable responses may therefore be significant: as the students moved from a level of education at which mechanical skills may have been considered relatively more important to one at which content was considered more important, they felt that the quality of the instruction they were receiving in writing dropped. The model provided by their high school education is thus regarded more favourably by these prospective teachers of writing at the grades 7-13 level than was the model provided by their university careers. Once again, this confirms the impression reported by the faculty members: where writing is concerned, much of what in effect constitutes teacher training is complete when future teachers complete their secondary education. Their university years provide for them another model, the lecture model, whose irrelevance they have to learn for themselves subsequently. The single year of teacher education cannot provide enough of an alternative to counter the effect of the thirteen years of elementary and secondary education, and so it is in those years that young teachers seek their models for what they themselves are to do when they begin to teach.

Nor is there much reason to suppose that the response to the students teachers' own writing during their teacher training could do much to extend or alter this model. In response to a specific question in Research Question 2 in the terms of reference for this study, we invited the respondents to indicate the emphasis on writing in courses other than specialized courses in English, Language Arts and Writing during the course of their teacher training. In an extension of the implications of that question, the questionnaire also invited the respondents to comment on the extent to which the responsibility of all teachers for the quality of student writing had been brought home to them in such courses.

On the whole, student teachers in the 7-13 domain suggested that little attention had been paid to the quality of their own writing. Of those who had taken a course in the area of Educational Foundations (97%), 37.9 claimed that the quality of their own writing had been given no attention in this course, and a further 27.6% reported that it had received very little. Those who had taken a course in Curriculum reported similar feelings, with 33.4% claiming the quality of their writing had been given no attention, and another 23.3% claiming that their writing had received very little attention. The corresponding scores reported for courses in the areas of Technical and Practical Courses (32.6% and 56.9%) and Special Education courses (39.7% and 57.9%) were in the same general range. For courses in Teaching Skills the scores rose still higher (39.6% and 65%), and for courses in Special

Interest areas they rose to an alarming level: 57.8% of the respondents claimed that their own writing had received no attention at all, and a further 18.3% claimed that it had received very little.

Nor did the student teachers suggest that they had been made to feel in these courses that they would have some responsibility for the writing abilities of their own future students, whatever their speciality. The percentages reporting that there had been very little or no stress on their future responsibilities descended from 75.5% of the students in Special Interest courses, 62% in Special Education courses, 61.3% in courses in Educational Foundations, 55.1% in Technical and Practical courses, 54.1% in courses in Teaching Skills. In only one area, the area of Curriculum, did a majority of respondents report that instructors stressed their responsibility for the writing ability of their future students: in this area, 57.8% of the respondents reported that there had been some stress or great stress on their own responsibilities.

By contrast, the student teachers taking a course in English or Language Arts were not as unfavourable in their reports of the attention given to their own writing abilities in these courses. Some 56.4% reported that "moderate," "considerable" or "great" attention had been paid to the calibre of their own writing in their specialized English or Language Arts course. However the only group who suggested that their own writing had received a great deal of attention was the very small group who had taken a specialized course in the teaching of writing. In the 7-13 domain, only 12% of the students had taken such a course; however almost 65% of these considered that the quality of their own writing had been given "moderate," "considerable" or "great" attention in the course.

The significance of these results obviously depends on the validity of the assumptions underlying the research question which was reflected in this part of the questionnaire. If it is valid to assume that instructors in teacher training courses in areas other than English and Language Arts specialist courses nonetheless have an obligation to give to their own students' writing the kind of attention envisaged in the questionnaire, and have a responsibility to try to ensure that all student teachers, no matter what their specialization, will assume part of the responsibility for the quality of the attention to be given to student writing in the schools, then the results do not give a particularly favourable view of what went on in the teacher training institutions, at least according to the students' perceptions.

2.32 Attitudes to Aspects of Literacy

The weakness of the undergraduate preparation in language, grammar and composition studies would lead one to expect fairly conservative attitudes to be revealed in the responses to those parts of the questionnaire which were explicitly attitudinal. On the whole, that is what the analysis of the responses to those parts of the questionnaire reveals.

An insignificant proportion of the students in the 7-13 subpopulation (a mere 1.4%) supported the claim that writing is relatively unimportant in the modern world and therefore need not be taught in schools to students who are reluctant to master the necessary skills. (For the exact wording of the three positions spelled out in the questionnaire, see Appendix II, question 36.) Even the moderate claim that "In recent years the basic skills have been underemphasized in the school system...; the school should place more emphasis on writing abilities, but should be careful not to overemphasize their importance" was supported by only 25.9% of the respondents. No fewer than 72.7% supported the strong claim that:

> It is essential that citizens should be able to read and write adequately. Practical considerations are not the only issue; the citizen who lacks skills in reading and writing is at the mercy of the political system, and is also deprived of enjoying many benefits of his cultural heritage. The importance of training students to read intelligently and to write well cannot be overemphasized.

The students in the 7-13 programs agreed strongly that the responsibility for teaching writing in the schools does not rest with English teachers alone. Only 2.2% of the 7-13 student teachers supported the statement in the questionnaire that "pupils should be taught how to write in English courses and by English teachers; teachers in other areas should be able to take the writing abilities of their students for granted." The remainder of the respondents divided themselves equally (48.9% each) between agreement with the assertion that "writing should be taught primarily by English teachers" (an assertion which included a concession that "all teachers have at least a limited responsibility to develop the writing abilities of their pupils") and the strong statement that "all teachers, whether English specialists or not, have a major responsibility for developing pupils' writing abilities."

It is not clear how this result should be interpreted. The 7-13 category as a whole included all the student teachers in K-13 and High School Assistant A and B programs who had designated English as their major or minor. However it also included all the High School Assistant A and B student teachers in the sample who had specialized in other areas in the course of their university training and who had not designated English as either a major or a minor in their teacher training program. We have no basis in the Faculty Survey for estimating to what extent the specialist teachers in areas other than English and the Language Arts might have been aware of the Language Across the Curriculum movement and its possible significance for those who would be teaching subjects other than English in their later careers. But it is striking to note that almost 50% of the population in 7-13 programs supported a view which is entirely compatible with the Language Across the Curriculum movement. It is even more striking to note that the proportion in this group dropped significantly when the analysis was restricted to the secondary English specialists, as will be seen subsequently.

To a much greater extent, the students in the 7-13 domain revealed either ignorance of or indifference to the findings of the research relating to the importance of teaching grammar. An overwhelming majority of the respondents (95.6%) considered that instruction in traditional grammar is either desirable or vital. In the case of mechanical skills such as spelling and punctuation, they showed themselves to be slightly more permissive: whereas only 4.4% felt that the teaching of traditional grammar is useless, 6.2% agreed that "Spelling and punctuation are the least important aspects of writing; the teacher who frequently corrects such errors is likely to discourage the student and impede the development of writing abilities." However a clear majority of the subpopulation supported the strong claim that mechanical skills such as spelling and punctuation are "vital." In these respects, the 7-13 group as a whole showed themselves to be more conservative than the secondary English specialists.

2.33 Practice Teaching

As noted in the discussion of practice teaching in the preceding chapter, a large part of the effectiveness of the teaching that takes place in the Faculties of Education may depend on whether or not students have the chance to observe teaching relevant to the subjects discussed in the Faculties, to weigh the case for and against teaching strategies used in their host schools which differ from what the Faculties advise, and to put into effect in their own practice teaching the advice received in the Faculties.

For student teachers who are specializing in English and Language Arts, the last two aspects of practice teaching should be the most important. However for student teachers who are not specialists in English or Language Arts but who subsequently are assigned teaching responsibilities in English or the Language Arts, the first may in fact be the only training they ever receive beyond the discussion of general principles applicable to all subjects in courses such as Educational Foundations and Curriculum.

Most of the students specializing at grades 7-13 had no opportunity in their practice teaching to observe the teaching of English or Language Arts at any level. The actual percentage of respondents who claimed to have observed at least some English or Language Arts classes was 39.8%. At first glance, this proportion seems low. In fact, however, it is reasonable enough, since a large proportion of the total number of eligible respondents were secondary-level specialists in subjects other than English.

Those who did observe classes in English or Language Arts, however, seem to have seen in the course of their observation very little that related directly in their view to the teaching of expository writing. The percentage of class time devoted to this topic, as reported by the students, is summarized in Table 2.4, which reports, for all levels from 7-8 to 13, broken down according to phase, the proportion of the 7-13 category which did not observe at all at any particular level, the percentage who did observe but who claimed that they had seen no teaching of expository writing at all, the proportion who claimed that 15% or less of the class time they had observed had been devoted to expository writing (this figure includes the preceding one), the mean percentage reported, and the standard deviation of the mean. As can be seen, among the student teachers who did observe some Language Arts or English class at the 7-13 levels, the percentage who claimed to have seen no expository writing taught at all varies from 21.5% to 65%. The proportion who claimed that they had seen 15% or less of their observation time devoted to exposition varied from a low of 47.1% to a high of 75%, depending on the level and phase. The mean percentage that they report having observed varies from 7.2% to a maximum of 17.38%.

The interpretation of these responses needs particular care. In the first place, the number of valid responses varies from a maximum of 60.23% in the report on grades 7 and 8 to the unacceptably low percentages in the reports on grades 9-10 Enriched and 11-12 Remedial. In all of the other levels and phases, however, the number of valid responses did reach an acceptable level. However the most important aspect of the results is that the proportion of valid responses is so low.

Furthermore, this section of the questionnaire again involves debatable assumptions. The first is simply the assumption, which the wording of the questionnaire conveyed fairly directly, that expository writing is intrinsically important for all the phases and levels listed. As noted in the report on our discussion with the Faculty members in the preceding chapter, a number of them deny this assumption. This important point is to be discussed further in the conclusion to this volume.

The second assumption is that the experience of observing the teaching of expository writing at some particular phase or level is itself beneficial to a future teacher of English and Language Arts. This consideration is presumably particularly important in the case of those student teachers who are not identified as English or Language Arts specialists during their teacher training. Realistically, there is no way to determine whether such observation is in fact beneficial. It is certainly conceivable that a particular student might be favourably impressed by a method of teaching exposition which we and our colleagues in the Faculties of Education would consider intrinsically dangerous; it is equally conceivable that a particular student might fail to see the good in an approach to the teaching of exposition which we and they would regard highly. Both risks are presumably most acute with the non-specialists.

Finally the question of the accuracy of the students' reports can again be raised. At best, the results can only be approximations; they may be distorted either by lapses of memory, or by a conscious decision to distort them one way or another depending on such factors as the students' attitudes to the topic of the questionnaire, and to the whole of their experience in the course of their practice teaching.

Table 2.3

REPORTED OBSERVATION OF EXPOSITORY WRITING IN PRACTICE TEACHING

	Percentage who did not Observe at all at this Level	Did Observe Classes at this Level			
		No Exposition Observed	0-15% Exposition Observed	Mean Percentage Observed	S.D.
7- 8	56.2	21.5	49	17.38	15.2
9-10 Remedial	88.9	32.4	61.3	13.42	17.23
9-10 General	84.8	40.8	56.8	15.83	18.07
9-10 Advanced	92	33.9	56.2	13.78	12.9
9-10 Enriched	98.7	47.6	62.4	13	15.4
11-12 Remedial	96.9	39.4	68.4	10.6	10.1
11-12 General	88.4	34.3	47.1	16.8	15.5
11-12 Advanced	91.2	30.1	46.8	15.7	12.3
11-12 Enriched	98.7	65	75	7.2	12.3
13 Advanced	92.7	47.2	53	12.9	13.8
13 Enriched	95.8	59.7	67.5	8.9	12.7

In a number of respects, the respondents' reports on their own practice teaching are probably more reliable. The percentage of students in the 7-13 domain who reported that they had not been able to teach Language Arts or English at all in the course of their practice teaching was 39.9%, which is virtually the same percentage as observed the teaching of English or Language Arts classes. The student teachers' reports on the amount of time they were able to devote to the teaching of expository writing in the course of their practice teaching is summarized in Table 2.4 which, as before, reports the percentage of the subpopulation which did not teach any class in Language Arts or English at the level specified, the percentage of those who did teach at that level but did not have any occasion to teach expository writing, the percentage who claimed that the amount of time they had devoted to exposition was 15% or less (this figure includes the preceding), the mean percentage of time devoted to exposition according to their reports, and the standard deviation of the mean. In two cases, the scores reported are unreliable because of the unacceptably low number of valid responses: the reports for the 9-10 Enriched group and the 11-12 Enriched group. For all other levels and phases, the number of students responding reached an acceptable level for a claim of reliability.

The obvious point that can be made on the basis of these figures is that if the teaching of expository writing at some level is taken to represent one kind of teaching experience which would be desirable for a majority of student teachers intending to specialize at the 7-13 level, then their chances of being able to do such teaching do not appear to have been particularly good: at the grade 7 and 8 level, 69.1% of the population either did not have the opportunity to teach at all, or had the opportunity to teach something, but not exposition. For all the other levels the percentage of the group which was not able to teach at those levels was still higher.

Table 2.4

REPORTED TEACHING OF EXPOSITORY WRITING IN PRACTICE TEACHING, 7-13 GROUP

	Did not Teach any (English) Class at this level	Did Teach Language Arts or English at this Level			
		No Exposition Taught	0-15% Exposition Taught	Mean Percentage Taught	S.D.
7- 8	59.3	24.2	49.3	16.8	14.8
9-10 Remedial	94.9	25.1	53.5	17.5	21.2
9-10 General	88.9	27.5	46.2	17.4	14.9
9-10 Advanced	92.9	29.7	48.9	16.26	14.3
9-10 Enriched	98.9	100	100	-	-
11-12 Remedial	97.9	41.8	62.9	12.4	12.1
11-12 General	91.3	33	47.2	15.5	13.2
11-12 Advanced	92.6	29.4	59.4	13.3	10.96
11-12 Enriched	99.6	32.2	37.5	-	-
13 Advanced	93.6	58.7	68.6	8.8	12.5
13 Enriched	98.7	16.4	59.1	17.2	12.1

On the whole, the students in this category were fairly positive in their evaluation of the comments of their associate teachers: only 17.7% felt that they had been "poor," whereas 30.1% considered them "somewhat" useful in their training, 30.3% "quite" useful, and 21.8% "very" useful. On the other hand, they felt that they had been given very little freedom in their teaching assignments. For example, in response to the question which asked them to what extent they had been given any choice as to the phase of the class they were to teach, 46.9% of the group reported that they had had no choice at all, and a further 27.1% reported that they had had very little. Slightly more than a quarter of the group reported that they felt they had been given at least some choice, however. As for the choice of the level of the classes they were to teach during their practice teaching, 53.3% felt that they had been given no choice at all; however 29.2% claimed that they had been given at least some choice.

2.4 Secondary English Specialists

The total number of respondents who, according to the unweighted data, were enrolled in High School A or B programs and who designated English as their major or minor was 52. Within this category 75.9% were enrolled in High School A programs and 25.1% in High School B programs. In addition, a group slightly smaller than the latter who were enrolled in K-13 programs had English as a major or minor. These students are also included in the following discussion of the secondary-level English specialists. Understandably, the students in this domain were somewhat better trained than the whole population: 25.9% had a pass B.A., 64% an honours B.A., 5.3% an M.A. and 4.8% a Ph.D. All but 7.2% of them had received their first degree in Ontario, and since no students from the Faculties at Ottawa or Nipissing or from the two O.T.E.C.'s were included in the category, its distribution among Ontario universities was quite different from that of the whole population, and in fact somewhat surprising. The results are tabulated in Table 2.5: in 1976-77, it was these universities that had trained Ontario's future secondary English teachers. What is immediately striking is, firstly, the lack of any apparent correlation between the institution at which the first degree had been taken and the institution at which the students were taking their teacher training, and secondly the absence of any correlation between the proportions of the domain having graduated from the institutions listed and the size or reputation of the universities represented. (For example, it may be noted that the list does not even include Queen's University).

Naturally all of this group had taken some English in the course of their undergraduate training. However only 42.7% were English majors, and another 32.2% combined majors with English as one of their undergraduate specialities. 2% reported that they had majored in other Humanities subjects, 1.4% in Social Science subjects, and (another surprise) 6.8% in Natural Science subjects.

Table 2.5

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
OF SECONDARY ENGLISH MAJORS AND MINORS

Carleton	19.3%
York	18.5%
Waterloo	12.6%
Toronto	12.5%
Trent	10.7%
Lakehead	8.8%
Western	5.7%
Ottawa	5.1%
Windsor	4.3%
Brock	1.2%
McMaster	1.2%

2.41 Preparation in Language and Composition

The fact of having had English as an undergraduate major or combined major did not ensure that this group took courses in language and composition that might be immediately relevant to their future work as English teachers. In point of fact, the only language course which a significant proportion of them had taken was history of the English language, a traditional course in university English departments, which 31.8% reported having taken. While much higher than that for the 7-13 group, this figure is not high. Such courses are usually compulsory, if at all, only for honours degrees in English rather than pass degrees, but the proportion having taken such a course is considerably lower than the proportion with an honours degree. It may be that this result hints that this group would not have been willing to take more courses in this area if they had been able to find them. For the most part, however, they did not find, or at all events they did not take, any of the less traditional but potentially more relevant courses listed on the questionnaire: 6.25% had taken a course in the structure of Modern English, 3.125% a survey of grammatical theories, 6.25% a course in composition and rhetoric. These results are not significantly different from those of the 7-13 subpopulation. The scores are so low that it is not meaningful to cross-tabulate them with the explicitly attitudinal questions in the hope of determining whether or not such courses correlated with different attitudes on the part of those who had taken them: their numbers are too small for the results to be reliable.

To a greater extent than the results from the whole population and from the 7-13 group, these results justify the complaint that the undergraduate preparation in English of future secondary English specialists is inadequate. It is astonishing that the proportion of this specialized population having taken such courses is not significantly different from the proportion in the 7-13 group.

On the other hand, the secondary English specialists seem to have received much more intensive training in such areas during their teacher training than did most of the non-secondary students who took a Language Arts course: as noted earlier in our discussion of the results of the Faculty Survey, the Language Arts courses tended to be shorter than the High School Assistant's A and B courses, and to form a smaller proportion of the students' whole program. The secondary English specialists reported having had some exposure to such fields as sociolinguistics, structural grammar and even transformational grammar in far greater proportions than did the whole 7-13 subpopulation. A detailed comparison can be seen in Table 2.6. Specifically, 49.9% of the secondary English specialists claimed that they had received some instruction in sociolinguistics during their teacher training, compared to 19.4% of the 7-13 group; 65.5% claimed to have received some instruction in structural grammar, compared to 42.6% of the 7-13 subpopulation; and 39.9% claimed to have received some instruction in transformational grammar, compared to 18.3% of the 7-13 group. These differences attest to the considerable effort made by those charged with the training of future secondary English specialists in the Faculties of Education to fill in some of the gaps left by the university English departments.

In their reports on the quality of the attention paid to their own writing skills in their secondary and undergraduate careers, the secondary English specialists were for the most part much more favourable than the population. In all, 83.7% of them claimed that the quality of the attention given to their own writing when they were in high school was fair to excellent; 70.3% claimed that it was fair to excellent at the undergraduate level (compared to 62.4% in the whole population); and 57.2% claimed that they had received adequate training in mechanical skills such as grammar, spelling and word usage during the undergraduate careers (compared to 54.6% of the population).

Almost certainly, these differences point to a difference in the kind of attention paid to student writing in undergraduate courses in English on the one hand and most other disciplines on the other. Nonetheless, the question of the nature of the model which this instruction provides for future English teachers remains somewhat problematic. That the attention given to the mechanics of writing is greater in university English departments than in other departments is almost certainly true. It may be true as well that English instructors pay more attention to such matters as the clarity and cogency of the argumentation in the essays they read, or at least that they are more likely to comment on such matters, than are instructors in other departments. As a model for the work of future secondary English teachers, however, the kind of attention paid to the writing of undergraduate English specialists is likely to be directly relevant only for that very small proportion of high school English students who go on to become university English majors, and even for such students as these, the model is hardly likely to be particularly apposite except at the grade 12 and 13 levels. For most other kinds of secondary English students, such a model is less relevant, and in some respects it may be harmful. This point too is to be discussed in the conclusion to this volume.

As for the Faculty of Education courses in areas other than English and the Language Arts, the secondary English specialists suggested that the amount of attention paid to their own writing in such courses had been slight. Indeed, in two areas the results for the secondary English specialists do not appear to be significantly different from those of the whole 7-13 group. Whereas 65.5% of the 7-13 group considered that the amount of attention paid to their own writing in their course in Educational Foundations had been little or none, the percentage of the secondary English group to report the same negative feelings was 66%. In the Curriculum courses, the respective scores of the secondary English specialists were still more negative than the 7-13 group -- 76.9% compared to 59.9% in the courses in Teaching Skills, and 87.1% compared to 76.1% in the courses in Special Interests. In addition, to a much greater extent than the whole 7-13 category, the student teachers in the secondary English group felt that there had been no particular stress in their non-specialist courses on the responsibility of all teachers for the quality of writing in the schools: the combined scores indicating little or no stress descended from 70.4% to 50.9%. The exception was once again the Curriculum course, where almost 70% of the secondary English group felt that the amount of stress placed on this topic was considerable or great.

In their specialized courses in English or the Language Arts, however, the secondary English specialists reported that considerably more attention had been paid to the quality of their written work than was the case in most of the non-specialized courses. Although 17.1% reported that no attention had been paid to the quality of their own writing and a further 24.6% reported very little, 23.4% felt that the amount of attention had been moderate, 28.9% considerable, and 6% great. However it was only that very small fraction of the group who were able to take a specialized course in the teaching of writing at their Faculty of Education who reported really strongly positive views of the quality of the attention given to their own writing: in this very small domain, amounting to a mere 18.4% of the secondary English specialists, the proportion of the student teachers who felt that little or no attention had been paid to the quality of their own writing was only 30.9%.

2.42 Attitudes to Aspects of Literacy

As a group, the prospective secondary English specialists proved to be somewhat less conservative in their responses to the attitudinal questions relating to grammar and mechanics than did the whole population surveyed. Their views of the responsibility for the quality of student writing differed noticeably from those of the surveyed population. So far as the latter question is concerned, none of the secondary English respondents suggested that the responsibility for the quality of student writing should devolve entirely upon English teachers. However only 38.4% of them agreed that all teachers have a major responsibility for the quality of student writing. This proportion is significantly lower than the proportion in the whole population. Conversely, 61.6% felt that English teachers have the primary responsibility, compared to 48.8% in the whole 7-13 subpopulation. On the one hand, then, there is no sign amongst the secondary English group of the attribution of exclusive responsibility to English teachers, whereas there is some evidence for that attitude among the whole 7-13 group. On the other hand, however, the views of the secondary English specialists are a great deal less compatible with the Language Across the Curriculum approach than are those of the 7-13 group as a whole.

It might be supposed that this difference in attitude is due merely to a realistic recognition on the part of prospective secondary English specialists that, when they start their teaching, their colleagues in other areas are likely to expect them to assume relatively more of the responsibility. In fact, however, this is not the case. A cross tabulation of the attitudinal variables by certificate program shows that relatively more of the High School Assistant A and B respondents as a whole attribute the responsibility for the quality of student writing to all teachers than is the case with the secondary English specialists alone. In the secondary group as a whole, then, the attitude which is valued by the proponents of the Language Across the Curriculum movement is more widespread among non-English specialists than it is among English specialists. In addition, a comparison of the results for the High School Assistant A group and the High School Assistant B group without respect to their specialisation shows that the A group accorded less of the responsibility to all teachers than did the B group. (The responses for the K-13 group are quite different: a clear majority of them did assign the primary responsibility to all teachers rather than to English specialists.) Taken together, these figures suggest a kind of territorial claim on the part of the secondary English specialists, and more particularly among the secondary English specialists in the A group. Far from recognizing that all teachers have a major responsibility for the quality of student writing, they seem to feel that the responsibility not only is theirs primarily, but ought to be. Since some of the faculty members whom we interviewed were, to say the least, aware of the Language Across the Curriculum movement and were in some cases enthusiastic supporters of it, this difference in the secondary English group was completely unexpected. Its implications will be discussed further in the conclusion to this volume.

In their evaluations of the importance of literacy in the modern world, the secondary English specialists differed only slightly from the whole 7-13 group, with 74.6% estimating the value of writing skills to be of vital importance and another 24.9% attributing to them at least some value. In their attitudes to basic mechanical skills and to traditional grammar, however, the secondary English specialists again distinguished themselves clearly from the whole 7-13 group. Whereas in the whole 7-13 group a mere 4.4% considered traditional grammar to be useless, in the secondary English domain the percentage expressing this view rose to 13.7%. At the same time, the percentage claiming to regard it as vital dropped from 47.0% to 36.8%. Similarly the proportion of the two groups which agreed that mechanical skills are ultimately among the least important aspects of writing ability rose from 6.2% among the 7-13 group to 18% among the secondary English population and, at the same time, the percentage claiming to regard mechanical skills as vital dropped from 53.3% in the 7-13 group to 33% in the secondary English subpopulation.

The factors involved in these differences between the two groups are probably complex. At one extreme they might merely signal a greater skill on the part of the secondary English specialists at detecting an answer likely to be regarded as safe, or (conversely) a greater readiness in the 7-13 group as a whole than in the secondary English specialists to adopt a fashionable extreme position. More importantly however, even if the secondary English specialists as a group were not well prepared in language study at the undergraduate level, they were significantly better prepared in it than was the population, in that they got much more intensive training in their field during their teacher training than did most of the non-secondary students, who took a Language Arts course. The exact effect of the undergraduate training remains to be tested in the discussion of the results of the Practising Teacher Survey. However it seems reasonable to attribute the different scores in this area to the difference at the Faculty of Education level. On the other hand, the fact that the results are not more different can be attributed to the inadequacy of certain aspects of their undergraduate training, the shortness of the time available for their training in the Faculties of Education, given the amount of material that has to be covered, and to certain other factors in the Faculties of Education. These too are to be discussed more fully later.

2.43 Practice Teaching, Secondary English Specialists

For the secondary English specialists, as for the rest of the population, practice teaching remains important because of the opportunity it affords to observe a range of teaching styles at several levels, because of the exposure it offers to techniques which may have been deprecated or left unmentioned in the Faculties of Education, and above all because of the opportunity it offers student teachers to teach and to benefit from the comments of their associate teachers. As for the very narrow areas within English which were the focus of this study, the analysis of the results showed that the secondary English specialists were able to observe them and teach them in greater proportions than the 7-13 group.

To consider first the percentage of observation time which, according to their reports, allowed them to observe the teaching of expository writing, the results are tabulated in Table 2.7 which, like Table 2.3, lists the percentage of the domain which did not observe at all at particular levels, the percentage which had been able to observe no exposition, the percentage claiming to have observed 15% or less (with the previous figure included, as before), the mean percentage observed, and the standard deviation of the mean. As can be seen from the Table, the secondary

Table 2.7

REPORTED OBSERVATION OF THE TEACHING OF EXPOSITION, SECONDARY ENGLISH GROUP

	Percentage who did not observe at this level	No exposition observed	0-15% exposition observed	Mean percentage observed	S.D. of mean
7- 8	70.8	16.1	40	26.6	21.2
9-10 Remedial	57.4	45.9	60	14.6	20.4
9-10 General	21.3	32.3	44.7	20.7	20.6
9-10 Advanced	46.1	27.6	59	13	10.9
9-10 Enriched	94.8	-	-	-	-
11-12 Remedial	82.3	60.6	88	6.8	9.7
11-12 General	18.4	28.8	41.7	18.6	15.8
11-12 Advanced	28.9	21.6	40	17.3	11.2
13 Advanced	44.4	36.1	46.7	15.9	13.3
13 Enriched	86.5	48	62.25	12.5	14.97

English specialists were able to observe classes at the 7-13 level in much greater proportions than was the whole of the 7-13 group. Nonetheless the proportion who either did not observe at a particular level, or who observed something other than the teaching of exposition, remains for the most part low.

A similar relationship holds between the scores for the amount of teaching of exposition done by the whole 7-13 group (Table 2.4) and the amount done by the Secondary English specialists (Table 2.8). The latter were able to teach classes at the 7-13 level in much greater proportions than was the whole of the 7-13 group, and the percentages of those who taught no exposition at particular levels tends to be somewhat lower among the Secondary English specialists. It remains the case, however, that the proportion of the domain able to have some experience of teaching exposition during the course of their practice teaching was low.

Table 2.8

REPORTED TEACHING OF EXPOSITION, SECONDARY ENGLISH GROUP

		Among those who did teach at this level:			
	Percentage who did not teach at this level	No Exposition taught	0-15% exposition taught	Mean percentage taught	S.D. of mean
7- 8	69.7	35.3	58.2	16.7	19.6
9-10 Remedial	70.9	27.2	45.5	20.3	21.6
9-10 General	34	21.9	40.1	18.7	14.2
9-10 Advanced	41	24.4	45.3	17.3	14.3
9-10 Enriched	90	100	-	-	-
10-12 Remedial	79.2	45.8	69	11.2	12
11-12 General	34.6	27.1	41	17.8	12.6
11-12 Advanced	36.8	27.6	61.9	13.0	10.4
11-12 Enriched	96.1	41.6	-	14.6	-
13 Advanced	54.4	49.6	70.2	10.9	12.9

As a whole, these figures are hardly grounds for rejoicing. However they do suggest that the practice teaching system is

Table 2.9

CHOICE OF ALL STUDENT TEACHERS AS TO PHASE AND LEVEL OF CLASSES TAUGHT DURING PRACTICE TEACHING

Choice as to Phase	Whole Population	7-13 Group	Secondary English Group
None	45.4	46	60.7
Very little	26.6	25.7	25.1
Some-Great	27.9	28.9	14.3
Choice as to Level			
None	54.7	50.9	59.2
Very little	16	16.6	30.6
Some-Great	29.3	32.5	10.3

On the other hand, they felt that they had rather more choice than did the population when it came to the subject matter that was to be taught, as can be seen from Table 2.10. In addition the

Table 2.10

CHOICE OF ALL STUDENT TEACHERS AS TO THE SUBJECT TAUGHT IN ENGLISH AND LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSES DURING PRACTICE TEACHING

	Whole Population	7-13 Group	Secondary English Group
None	27.4	32.7	16.9
Very little	34.1	31	41.5
Some	31.9	29.3	40.3
Great	6.6	7	1.2

Secondary English Specialists considered the associate teachers' comments to have been slightly more useful to them than did the population. The relevant percentages are presented in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11

USEFULNESS OF ASSOCIATE TEACHERS' COMMENTS
(Whole Population)

	Whole Population	7-13 Group	Secondary English Group
Poor	17.7	19.9	6.2
Somewhat Useful	30.1	27.7	29.7
Quite Useful	30.3	31.1	35.9
Very Useful	21.8	21.2	28.2

The view of practice teaching which comes out of this part of the Survey as a whole is very much in line with what our colleagues in the Faculties led us to expect. Their feeling that the present arrangement is less than satisfactory because of their inability to control what their students will see and do during their practice teaching is on the whole borne out by the results. This is less markedly the case, however, for the secondary English specialists than it is for the population. Equally, the secondary English specialists appear to feel that they have benefitted to an even greater extent than the whole population from the comments of the associate teachers. This aspect of practice teaching is clearly beneficial. That the whole of the experience of practice teaching is not more beneficial is due, however, to the demands of the school systems in which the student teachers are to do their practice teaching. There may not be any solution to this problem without very fundamental changes in the organization of practice teaching.

THE SURVEY OF PRACTISING TEACHERS

3.1 Introduction

The Survey of Practising Teachers was the third of the three formal surveys undertaken for this project, and also by far the most extensive and, we feel, the most revealing. Its aim was to enable us to draw on the insights of practising teachers as they reported and reflected on those aspects of their professional training that related to their work as teachers of writing.

3.11 Procedures

3.111 The Questionnaire

A copy of the forbiddingly long questionnaire used for the Survey of Practising Teachers is included in this volume as Appendix III. Because we had more time for the preparation of the questionnaire for this survey than we had had for the students' teachers, we were able to design it more carefully, and although it is still not without problems (we were not able to pretest it extensively), it was on the whole considerably more successful.

It was divided into six sections. The first sought specific demographic information relating especially to certification and personal background. The second elicited information about present responsibilities. When the questionnaire was designed, we thought we would be able to administer it not only to secondary teachers but also to teachers at the intermediate level. Since we could not, much of this section proved to be unnecessary. We wanted to know about the teachers' present responsibilities not only to check on whether they were not teaching English at all (in which case they had to be excluded from the sample population), but also because we hypothesized that teachers' attitudes might correlate in part with the proportion of their time devoted to English rather than some other subject. In addition, we wanted to compare the teachers in our sample in this respect with the teachers in the sample of the Interface Study, which at that time had not been published. As it turned out, the details of actual teaching responsibilities proved to be relatively unrevealing and they are not reported in this study. However the teachers' estimates of the amount of their time spent on writing, expository writing, language study, and so on, and also the information they reported on the source of the syllabus they were following, provided us with relevant information. Section C asked teachers to report on their views of the importance of various aspects of grammar, language study, writing skills and specific skills relating to expository essays, according to the level of students. Section D was concerned with the respondents' university training, eliciting, first, information as to what their university education had been, and then more particularly whether or not they had taken various courses in language study, composition or rhetorical theory and how useful they considered such courses to have been in their subsequent work as teachers. This section ended with an open question inviting the respondents to comment further on the relevance of university courses to the education of teachers.

The fifth section dealt with teacher education. In the same kind of way, it elicited information as to where their training had been, how it had been structured, what it had contained, and how effective they judged it to have been as preparation for their subsequent work. We also asked the respondents to report on in-service training of various sorts completed since they received their first teacher's certificate and to report on their judgments of the usefulness of such training. This section also ended with an open question inviting comments on teacher education.

The last section replicated the section of the Student Teacher Questionnaire which had invited the respondents to identify the position most nearly corresponding to their own on such topics as the responsibility for teaching writing, the importance of grammar, spelling and punctuation, the relative importance of literacy in the modern world, and so on. Lastly, there was a final open question inviting further comments.

In many respects the teachers' comments are extraordinarily interesting, and although they can be reported only in summary and aggregated form in this report, they would, if collected, make a thought-provoking anthology of the teachers' opinions on the questions being examined in the questionnaire.

As has already been noted, this questionnaire was extremely long, and because of the problems noted in the Introduction, we were uncomfortably aware that teachers would receive it at the worst possible time: in the middle of June. In the circumstances, the response rate was extraordinary and we would like to record our gratitude to the large number of teachers who, at such a busy time, took time to answer our questions.

3.112 The Sample

As has already been noted, we originally expected to be able to sample the population of teachers teaching any aspect of English or Language Arts from grade 7 to grade 13. Once we discovered that the Ministry was not in a position to make available to us the information that would have been necessary for us to do so, we started to investigate other ways of getting the relevant information. Eventually Dr. R. Wolfe, one of the principal investigators of the Interface Study, suggested to us that our only hope was the membership lists of the various Teachers' Federations. Even by this means, however, it proved to be impossible to acquire the relevant information about teachers teaching at the grade 7 and 8 levels, and we were thus forced to restrict the survey to teachers at the secondary level. The executive of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation kindly agreed to allow us to use their membership lists on certain conditions, and the information that they were able to provide for us became the basis for the sample of practising teachers.

On the advice of the statistical consultant for this part of the project, Dr. D.K. Dale of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at Carleton University, a self-replicating systematic cluster sample design was selected for this part of the study.

The details of the selection procedure are given in sections 1 and 2 of Professor Dale's report, "Procedures for a Survey of Practising English Teachers in Ontario Secondary Schools," which is included in this volume as Appendix I.

3.113 Administration of the Questionnaires

Initially questionnaires were distributed to the teachers in the sample through their school board office, which was asked to assume the responsibility for distributing the questionnaires to the selected teachers and then returning them to us. This first round was complete, in most cases, by the end of July. Non-respondents to the first round were then sent a second copy of the questionnaire by mail, and a third questionnaire was mailed subsequently to those who had still not replied. Thus although coding of responses began towards the end of July, it could not be completed until September of 1977.

The details of the response rates by region are given in Appendix I, Table A 3. As Professor Dale notes, the weighted response rate for the Survey of Practicing Teachers was approximately 63%, an unusually high response rate for a survey of this type, and all the more remarkable in view of the length of the questionnaire and the time of its reception.

After the data from all the questionnaires had been coded, key-punched and entered on the computer in an SPSS systems file, weights (defined here as the inverse of the response rates by Region by Sample) were added. The procedures used for estimating variance are discussed by Professor Dale in Appendix I, section 3.

3.2 Results

At the time of the survey, a clear plurality of those teaching English in Ontario secondary schools (44.6%) held a permanent High School Specialist's Certificate. The next largest group held Permanent H.S. Assistant's Certificate (19%). A further 16.9% held an Interim H.S. "B" Certificate, and 16.6% an Interim H.S. "A" Certificate. 2.9% held EST 1, 2, 3 or 4 or some other certificate. They ranged in age from 23 to 65, with a mean age of 36.5 (S.D. = 8.76), and 56.6% of them were male. A majority of them had been born in Ontario (70.3%), with the next largest native origins being 6.4% for the United Kingdom, 4.7% for Quebec, 4.6% for Europe excluding Great Britain, and 2.7% for the U.S.

3.21 University Education

All but 0.2% of the surveyed population had taken some courses at the university level, and 98% of them had completed at least one university degree. In the case of two respondents, representing 0.2% of the population, the highest degree was a doctorate. A Master's degree was the highest qualification of a further 28.1% of the population surveyed. Of those who had taken an M.A., 56.7% had taken it in English, 4.5% in some other language, 7.6% in some other humanities subject, 2.2% in a Natural Science, 17.2% in a Social Science, and 11.8% in some other discipline. A plurality of the population (42.4%) had completed their degree between 1971 and 1976, and all but 17.9% had taken it after 1961. Over 70% of them had taken their degree at an Ontario university, 14.8% at an American university, 6% elsewhere in Canada, and 7% elsewhere. The breakdown for Ontario institutions is given in Table 3.1

Table 3.1

ONTARIO INSTITUTIONS GRANTING MASTER'S DEGREES TO ONTARIO ENGLISH TEACHERS

University	Percentage
Ottawa	6.5
Toronto	39.5
Carleton	7.2
Western Ontario	8.8
McMaster	4.9
York	3.2
Queen's	5.9
Windsor	12
Waterloo	3.8
Lakehead	2.3
Laurentian	1
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	2.1
Guelph	1.3
Brock	1.4

Once again the difference between the size and repute of the institutions involved and the distribution of this population is remarkable. It suggests that, for that sizable proportion of teachers who have upgraded themselves professionally after beginning their careers as teachers, simple convenience is a major factor in their choice: they do not, or cannot, leave the area in which they are already established in order to complete a Master's degree. Hence, for example, the relatively large proportion completing a Master's degree at Windsor. On the other hand, the difference between the figures for York and Toronto suggest that where a choice is available locally, the reputation of the university may be a significant factor in the choice. Some of the implications of these facts are to be discussed in Chapter 4 in relation to the recognition of Certificate programs offered by Faculties other than Faculties of Education.

Altogether 55.4% of the population reported that they had a B.A. Honours degree or four-year B.A. (This figure must include some of the previous group.) The mean value of the date at which this had been completed was 1965 (S.D.=8.7), with the range from 1934 to 1977 and the median 1967. 83.4% of these teachers had taken their B.A. Hons. at an Ontario university, with the next largest groups represented by the United States (4.3%), the United Kingdom (4.1%) and Quebec (3%). The breakdown by Ontario institutions is given in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

ONTARIO INSTITUTIONS GRANTING B.A. HONS DEGREES TO ONTARIO ENGLISH TEACHERS

University	Percentage
Ottawa	0.6
Toronto	33.2
Carleton	7.9
Western Ontario	21.2
McMaster	7.7
York	4.2
Queen's	7.8
Windsor	6.6
Waterloo	2.8
Lakehead	1
Laurentian	0.8
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1
Trent	2.6
Guelph	1.1
Brock	0.7

Of those who had taken a four-year B.A. degree, 51.1% had majored in English and a further 27.9% had combined English and another subject for their majors. Other languages accounted for 2.5% of the domain, other Humanities subjects for 5.4% and Social

Science subjects for 4.7%.

Altogether 87.8% of the population had a Bachelor's degree. (Again this figure includes some of the previous groups.) The mean values of the date at which this had been completed was 1965 (S.D.=7.2), with the range from 1939 to 1977 and the median 1967. A slightly smaller percentage (82.6%) of this population had completed their degree in Ontario, with the next largest groups being the U.S. (3.6%), Quebec (3.1%) and Manitoba (2.7%), with no other Province or national group representing more than 1% of the remainder. The breakdown for Ontario institutions is given in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

ONTARIO INSTITUTIONS GRANTING B.A. DEGREES TO
ONTARIO ENGLISH TEACHERS

University	Percentage
Ottawa	5.7
Toronto	22.9
Carleton	6.2
Western	21.2
McMaster	6.9
York	4.2
Queen's	8
Windsor	7.6
Waterloo	4

Lakehead	1.9
Laurentian	3.8
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	5
Trent	0.6
Guelph	1.2
Brock	0.6

Of those who had taken a Bachelor's degree, 33.1% had majored in English and a further 37.1% in English and another subject combined. Other languages accounted for 4.2% of the remainder, other Humanities subjects for 7%, Social Science subjects for 11.6%.

It is clear that those who teach English in Ontario secondary schools are predominantly products of Ontario universities, in the main have completed their academic training with specialisation in English, and have done so within the last twenty years. This fact makes it much easier than would otherwise have been the case to determine what kind of undergraduate and graduate instruction the respondents might have had in matters relating to the teaching of language and writing in the schools. At the same time, the number of respondents who completed their undergraduate training in the United States or Britain is sufficiently large to allow for some cautious comparisons on the basis of the assumption that there are national differences in undergraduate English Education.

Only 4.1% of the population had never taken any university course in the study of English literature at any level. The percentage of those who had not taken any university course relating to the study of the English language was 52.1%. This figure is much lower (by c. 20%) than the corresponding figure for the student teachers. However the courses taken as language courses were almost exclusively the traditional "language" courses of university English departments: Old and Middle English, Old Norse, History of the English language. Old English had been taken by 26.6% of the population, Middle English by 24.4%, a combined Old and Middle English course by 6.2%, Old Norse by 1.1%, and the history of the language by 23.2%. (These figures of course are not mutually exclusive.) Only 8.3% of the population had taken a course on the structure of modern English, 7.8% a course on composition or rhetoric, and 5.8% a course on grammatical theory. Low as they are, these figures are higher than the figures for the English specialists among the student teachers. But just as in the case of the students it is justifiable to say that they had not taken, and perhaps had not the opportunity to take, the kinds of courses in language and writing that our colleagues in the Faculties of Education would have liked to be able to build on, so also it is fair to say that an overwhelming majority of practising teachers of English have not taken the kinds of courses in English language and writing which would provide them with the kind of background knowledge required for the implementation of the new Guidelines.

On the whole, those teaching English felt that the kind of emphasis given to their own writing during their university undergraduate careers was fairly satisfactory, as can be seen from Table 3.4, which summarized responses to Question 104, on the respondents' evaluation of the emphasis placed on their own writing while they were undergraduates.

Table 3.4

EMPHASIS ON WRITING DURING UNDERGRADUATE YEARS

Non-Existent	2.6%
Very Low	8.7%
Intermittent	31.6%
Quite High	34.7%
Very High	21.6%
Excessive	0.8%

3.22 Teacher Training

The dates at which the teachers had completed their first teaching certificate ranged from 1935 to 1976, with the mean value at 1965 (S.D.=8; median = 1967). The institutions which accounted for most of the responses were the Ontario College of Education (27.2%), the University of Toronto (17.2%), McArthur College, Queen's University (12.4%) and Althouse College of Education, University of Western Ontario (11.1%). A further 22.1% had received their teacher education at some other Ontario institution, including not only the then extant Faculties of Education and the former Toronto and Hamilton Teacher Education

Colleges, but also a number of others no longer extant, including the Lakeshore Teachers' College, the London Teachers' College, the North Bay Teachers' College, the Ottawa Normal School, and so on. Altogether 90% of the population received their teacher education in Ontario. Outside of Ontario, the only jurisdictions that accounted for more than 1% of the population were the United Kingdom (3.8%) and the United States (1.8%), with Quebec coming close at 0.9%.

For 61.8% of the population, teacher education had consisted of one year of study, and for another 30.6% of two summers. Only 2.5% had followed a two-year certification program, and only 1.9% a three- or four-year program. The course work had included a compulsory course in the teaching of composition in the case of 24.7% of the population. A further 2.4% had taken such a course as an option. But 72.9% of the population had never taken such a course. Over two thirds of the population (70.3%) had taken a compulsory course in the teaching of secondary English as part of their teacher training, and a further 6.7% had taken such a course as an option. In addition, 17.7% of the population had taken a compulsory course in the teaching of Language Arts at levels K-8, and a further 3.6% had included such a course as an option. Only 7.7% of the population had taken a course in English composition or rhetoric aimed at improving their own writing skills as part of their teacher education, and in the case of 3.3% of these the course had been taken as an option. When asked what percentage of their teacher education course work in Language Arts in English had been devoted to preparation for teaching expository writing, teachers' answers ranged from zero to 100%, but the mean percentage reported was 13.6% (S.D.=16.987), and the significance of these figures has to be understood in the light of a previous question which revealed that direct instruction in English or Language Arts constituted a mean of only 35% of all the instruction received during teacher education (S.D.=0.8, range 100%). Only slightly over a half of the population reported that the quality of their own writing had been given more than perfunctory attention during the course of their teacher training. Altogether 47.2% reported that their instructors had marked their assignments in such a way as to indicate little concern with the writing abilities of student teachers.

3.23 Practice Teaching

For 10.4% of the population, their teacher training had included no practice teaching at all. For 4.7% their practice teaching had taken the form of an internship, and for another 7.6% practice teaching had included both an internship and practice teaching sections. The mean number of weeks spent on practice teaching was 11 (S.D.=11.8; range=97 weeks). In the course of their practice teaching, 40.2% of the population had observed English or Language Arts classes at the 7-13 levels, and those in this domain reported a mean of 49.5% of the total time spent in observation had involved observation of English and Language Arts classes at these levels (S.D.=27.5; range 100%). Of those who had

had such an occasion to observe the teaching of English or the Language Arts, 67.2% reported that what they observed included the teaching of exposition, other kinds of writing, or related language skills.

As for their own teaching during their practice teaching or internship, 78.7% of the population had had some chance to teach English or Language Arts at the 7-13 levels, and those who did so reported that they had been able to spend an average of 52.6% of the whole of their teaching time on giving classes in English or Language Arts (S.D.=25.4; range = 100%). Slightly over 50% of these had had no opportunity to teach exposition, but 64.2% had had an opportunity to teach some other mode of writing, and 70% had had an opportunity to teach language skills that they considered to be relevant to the development of writing abilities.

3.3 Teachers' Evaluations of Their Training

The total accumulated teaching experience of the respondents to the Survey of Practising Teachers represents many thousands of years of teaching experience. As we have seen, the vast majority of the population they represented was a product of Ontario education, and for the most part comparatively recent Ontario education. The kind of instruction they had received in their undergraduate training in English and their subsequent teacher training was not greatly different from the kinds in force at the time of our surveys. What can these teachers tell us as they reflect on the value to them of their preparation for their chosen profession?

3.31 Evaluation of University Training

A series of questions in the questionnaire asked the respondents to give their view of the usefulness of particular types of university English courses they had taken, firstly for the teaching of writing generally, secondly for related language skills, and lastly for teaching exposition in particular.

Although a few abusive comments revealed that not all respondents had read it, these terms were explained in the covering letter attached to each questionnaire (see Appendix III). "Writing of all kinds" was elaborated both in terms of James Britton's taxonomy of poetic, expressive and transactional; again in terms of creative versus (implicitly) non-creative; and thirdly in traditional terms as description, narrative and exposition (the latter implicitly including argumentation). In addition, teachers who considered such work as sentence combining to be part of their writing curriculum were encouraged to report on it in these terms too, but we asked the respondents to exclude reading, oral work, and other kinds of experiences that might be part of the prewriting exercises or preparation for writing.

"Language Skills related to writing" were defined, with some openness, as matters of mechanics, correct usage, traditional grammar, levels of discourse and usage, other kinds of grammar, work in semantics or vocabulary building, etc., depending on teachers' own views. Again we asked teachers, as far as possible, to exclude language skills that in their views did not relate directly to writing.

Finally, we defined "exposition" largely by example, as "completed pieces of formal edited writing, such as compositions on literary topics, research projects, expository essays, and so on."

We noted also that we did not wish to imply that we thought all respondents ought to be teaching all the topics mentioned. Rather, we claimed that we were including a wide range of possibilities because we assumed that some teachers might be teaching some of them.

The tables which follow summarize the judgements of the teachers as to the usefulness for their work in teaching these aspects of writing of firstly, undergraduate courses in the study of literature; secondly, courses in earlier stages of English (Old and Middle English) and Old Norse; thirdly, courses in the history of the English language; fourthly, courses in the structure of English and surveys of grammatical theories; and finally courses in composition and rhetoric.

As the table shows, the population surveyed did not agree with the claim made, for example, in the Priestley-Kerpneck Report that courses in Old and Middle English provide "a very adequate training indeed . . . for teaching in the school system" (Priestley and Kerpneck, 1976: 71). On the contrary, the

Table 3.5

EVALUATIONS OF THE USEFULNESS OF UNIVERSITY ENGLISH COURSES FOR TEACHING ASPECTS OF WRITING

Course:	Usefulness to:	Estimated Usefulness (Percentages)		
		Not at all	Somewhat	Very
English Literature	Writing	20.7	54.1	25.2
	Language Skills	36.8	44.5	18.7
	Exposition	19.2	50.4	30.3
OE, ME, ON	Writing	55.9	38.8	5.4
	Language Skills	32.5	55.2	12.4
	Exposition	65.8	28.7	5.5
History of the English Language	Writing	32.4	56.9	10.7
	Language Skills	20.8	64.1	15
	Exposition	46.4	44.1	9.5
Structure, Grammar	Writing	23.6	42	34.4
	Language Skills	16.4	42.6	41
	Exposition	33.8	35.1	31.2
Composition, Rhetoric	Writing	6.7	50.1	43.6
	Language Skills	12.9	41.8	45.3
	Exposition	10.4	46.6	43.2

traditional "language courses" of the university English syllabus were rated the least useful of the types of courses singled out for comment, and this even for the area of language skills. Courses in English literature were judged to have been more useful for these purposes. However the courses which clearly get strongly favorable ratings for all purposes are those which are (still) least likely to be offered in university English Departments: courses in the structure of modern English and survey courses in grammatical theories, and courses in composition and rhetoric. The opinion of the practising teachers who had been able to take such courses confirms the view of the Faculty of Education professors who regarded such courses as a desirable aspect of prospective English teachers' undergraduate education. We discuss the ramifications of this view further in Section 4.11 ff.

The respondents' open comments on their university education in relation to their work as teachers of writing broke down into four areas. A first set of comments, offered by 22.5% of the respondents, related to other courses considered to be relevant to the training of teachers. In this domain, by far the largest group recommended Latin (24.2%). The next largest group (13.1%) recommended courses in Philosophy and especially Logic, and 9% recommended courses in Linguistics. A further 21.6% of the respondents commented on the aspects of their own university experience that they considered to have been useful to their teaching of writing. The largest group of responses here commented on the usefulness of the experience of having had to write expository essays in university (20.9%) and an almost identical proportion (20.8%) commented that their university education had stretched their own ability to use language, in ways that they considered useful to them as teachers. Other comments singled out the demand for logical thought at university as something that had had beneficial effects on their teaching. A third set of comments, made by 19.3% of the respondents, focused specifically on the environment of writing at university. Among the topics mentioned in this category, by far the most frequent set of comments related simply to the practice of writing at university (31.3%), but 15.8% of the respondents in this domain also commented on the standards of evaluation used at university. On the other hand, in a final set of comments, 3.2% offered comments which suggested that university standards needed to be raised, either for admission requirements (11.7%) or for in-course requirements; 21.5% commented directly that the standard of writing required in universities was too low. A number of respondents (21.1%) offered comments relating to other aspects of university failings that they considered relevant to the subject of the questionnaire. Of these, 48.8% commented that university courses had not been useful to them at all in their work as teachers of writing. In addition, 9.8% suggested that undergraduate courses which prospective teachers should take include courses in composition and language; they also recommended fewer courses in literature. On the other hand, 7.8% made comments to the effect that it is not the function of universities to offer what the respondents considered to be "basic" skills. Similarly in a set of comments made by 12.3% of the respondents relating to specific courses which future teachers should take, 28.4% commented that universities should not have to do what the respondents considered to be the work of the Faculties of Education. A further 3% commented that courses do not make teachers; this challenge is to be discussed further in Chapter 4. In this domain, 22.8% of the respondents recommended more courses in English. As for positive recommendations, 22.8% of those who offered comments in this area recommended more courses in English Language and Linguistics; another 14.6%, courses in composition; and a further 10.9%, courses in both.

3.32 Value of Teacher Education Courses

The part of the questionnaire concerned with Teacher Education courses contained a number of questions inviting respondents to assess the usefulness of particular courses to their subsequent work as teachers of writing generally, related language skills, and exposition, in the same way as for the university courses. The courses singled out for consideration were courses specializing in the teaching of writing; secondary English courses; Language Arts courses; and courses in composition and rhetoric. The responses are summarized in Table 3.6.

As the table shows, the respondents were quite favorable in their assessment of Language Arts courses generally, and to an

Table 3.6

EVALUATIONS OF THE USEFULNESS OF TEACHER EDUCATION COURSES FOR TEACHING ASPECTS OF WRITING

Course:	Usefulness to:	Estimated Usefulness (Percentages)		
		Not at all	Somewhat	Very
Teaching Writing	Writing	17.8	45.2	37
	Language Skills	26.4	38.9	34.8
	Exposition	24.9	43.4	31.8
Secondary English	Secondary English	13.5	44.5	42
	Writing	36.8	44.6	18.6
	Language Skills	42.8	41	16.2
	Exposition	46.7	36.7	16.6
Language Arts	Language Arts	25	42	32.9
	Writing	26.1	49.3	24.6
	Language Skills	26.3	48.6	25.1
	Exposition	33.6	45.7	20.7
Composition	Writing	18.5	36.9	44.5
	Language Skills	22.3	32.4	45.3
	Exposition	15.9	35.5	48.9

even greater extent considered secondary English courses to have been useful to their work teaching English at the secondary level. However they did not feel the same degree of satisfaction with those courses when it came to teaching writing specifically. Although the Language Arts courses were somewhat more favourably rated in this respect than the secondary English courses, the only courses which were given strongly favourable ratings were courses in the teaching of writing and courses in composition and rhetoric, both of them courses that are extremely rare in Faculty of Education programs.

Comments on general points relating to the teaching of teachers were made by 13.5% of the respondents. Of this group, 44.7% commented directly that the Faculties of Education are useless. A further 14% commented that experience is the only useful guide, and similarly 11.1% claimed that one can learn to teach only by teaching. However 11.9% commented that they had been lucky in having a good host teacher, and 6% felt that their observation periods had been particularly useful. 9.1%, on the other hand, repeated the claim that teachers are born, not made.

In a set of comments relating to the kinds of courses offered in the Faculties of Education, by 12.6% of the respondents, 10.1% recommended more courses in grammar teaching, 6.5% more courses in language and language teaching, a further 5.4% more courses in both those areas. 11% thought more courses in writing and the teaching of writing should be offered; a further 10.3% courses in grammar and writing, 5.7% courses in language and writing, and another 36.8% courses in all three areas. The only comments in this group that did not relate to these recommendations were comments made by 13.3% of the respondents to the effect that the old Ontario College of Education was useless as preparation for the teaching of any of these subjects. In addition, there was a very high frequency of comments critical (and sometimes abusive) of Faculty of Education instructors generally. (In this connection, it may be relevant to note that 4.2% of the population had been directly involved in teacher education).

3.33 Value of Practice Teaching

As before, a section of the questionnaire asked respondents to evaluate the usefulness of particular aspects of their practice teaching as part of the preparation for their work in teaching writing. The particular areas singled out for commentary were, first, observation; second, the practice teaching itself; and third, the host teachers' comments and advice. The results are summarized in Table 3.7.

With respect to the last of these, it should be noted that 45% of the population had served as host teachers at some time. An overwhelming majority of the population (83.7%) felt that associate teachers should have some special training for their work beyond what they had already received in the course of their teacher training. In addition, 51.4% of the population felt that the Faculties of Education should be able to exercise more control over the teaching assignments given to students during their

Table 3.7

EVALUATIONS OF THE USEFULNESS OF PRACTICE TEACHING

Aspect:	Usefulness for:	Estimates of Usefulness (Percentages) Little/ None	Moderate	Considerable
Observation	Writing	39.5	41.8	10.9
	Language Skills	36.8	44.8	18.4
	Exposition	50.3	34.7	15
Practice	Writing	38.2	42.8	19
	Language Skills	40	39	21
	Exposition	52.7	30.7	16.6
Host Teacher	Writing	49.3	37.1	13.6
	Language Skills	48.3	37.4	14.3
	Exposition	59.9	28.8	11.4

practice teaching.

Although practice teaching was overall highly ranked compared to other aspects of teaching (see 3.4), the figures in Table 3.7 suggest that, in the light of their own experiences as teachers, the respondents to the teacher survey were not particularly impressed with the usefulness of their practice teaching to their subsequent work as teachers of writing. On the whole, the evaluations are less positive than the evaluations of most of their course work. This difference in emphasis between the student teachers' and the practising teachers' responses is of some importance, and will be discussed further in Chapter 4 in relation to practice teaching and in-service training.

A total of 11.5% of the respondents offered comments on the relationship of theory and practice in teacher training. Of these, 40.8% commented that they considered their own teacher training to have been too theoretical, and 27.4% recommended an internship as the best kind of practice teaching. On the other hand, 3.7% commented that they had been educated in an internship system and considered it less desirable than other systems. In another set of comments relating to in-service training by 5.5% of the respondents, 27.3% recommended more in-service training for practising teachers; a further 17% specifically recommended in-service courses in language; a further 26.2% in-service courses in grammar; and a further 26.7% recommended some combination of such courses. However only 3.4% recommended in-service courses specifically in the teaching of writing. This imbalance in this set of responses is also symptomatic, we feel, of much more than is apparent at first glance: most teachers, considering what we have seen of what their education has been, are not in a position to conceive of courses on writing other than courses in composition and rhetoric. For their purposes, courses in composition and rhetoric are, they recognize, not particularly useful. The kind of course that they probably need, an intensive course surveying recent research in writing and its implications for classroom teachers, is so rare that it is not considered among the list of possibilities. The implications of this fact are also to be taken up in Chapter 4.

3.4 Overall Rating of Aspects of Teacher Education

One of the last sections of the questionnaire, immediately preceding the last attitudinal questions, asked teachers to rank ten different aspects of teacher education in terms of their overall usefulness to them in their work. The items selected for ranking were undergraduate English language courses, undergraduate English literature courses, other undergraduate courses, university courses taken since the start of the teaching career, courses taken at teacher education institutions, observation of teachers during practice teaching, teaching during practice teaching, Faculty of Education courses or Ministry of Education courses taken since the start of the teaching career, other in-service training, and finally professional development day workshops, conferences, and so on.

The overall ranking of the responses according to the mean rank of each aspect is given in Table 3.8. The ranking according to median values is identical. The standard deviations which are cited show that in all cases there was quite a wide divergence of opinion. For this reason, we have also reported the modal rank of each aspect, and the percentage of the respondents who, in their answer to the particular question, chose the modal value.

What the table shows most clearly of all is that, despite the rather lukewarm evaluations which the practising teachers gave to practice teaching in relation to the teaching of writing, they nonetheless considered it just as valuable as the student teachers did when considering it in relation to the whole of their professional training. In addition we wish to point out particularly the low rankings of Ministry in-service courses and professional development day workshops. We will be discussing the implications of these rankings further in Chapter 4.

3.5 Attitudes Toward Aspects of Literacy

One section of the questionnaire was directed towards determining the importance given by the respondents to certain skills as well as to certain kinds of knowledge associated at least by some educators with the teaching of composition. These included language skills, writing skills, and specific skills relating particularly to exposition.

Our intention was to determine not how much time was actually spent in teaching these skills but rather the importance attached

Table 3.8

RANKED VALUE OF ASPECTS OF TEACHER TRAINING

Rank	Aspect	Mean Rank	S.D.	Median Rank	Modal Rank	Percentage
1	Practice Teaching	3.32	2.27	2.86	1	31.3
2	Undergraduate literature courses	3.6	2.18	3.26	1	25.1
3	Observation during practice teaching	4.12	2.2	3.83	2	25.1
4	Undergraduate language courses	4.14	2.41	3.82	1	15.8
5	Teacher Training courses	4.15	2.2	4.04	3	16.4
6	University courses while teaching	4.33	2.51	4.08	1	17.9
7	In-service courses otherthan Ministry or Faculty of Ed.	4.41	2.56	4.21	1	15.8
8	Undergraduate degree courses other than English	4.85	2.2	4.79	6	15.4
9	Ministry In-service courses	4.91	2.63	4.87	3	16.9
10	P.D. Day workshops, conferences, etc.	5.04	2.28	5.01	5	14.5

to them. Presumably the time devoted to these skills would in the end relate to the relative importance given them by the teacher, but that time is also dependent on a number of extrinsic considerations, including the relative emphasis given composition and language skills in the whole English curriculum. Until the 1977 Ministry Guidelines for English, the amount of time to be allocated to language and writing was not specified by the Ministry, but the general feeling was that the lion's share of the program was being devoted to literature. Certainly such an emphasis was in keeping with the Ministry document then in force. However the recent Ministry documents, as mandated, require that as much as 50% of the time be devoted to language and writing. In light of this time apportionment, and in the light of their responses on the questionnaire, we can determine broadly the kind of time-commitment teachers would be prepared to make for each of the various skills we have specified.

For each item, the respondents were asked to determine how important they considered teaching about and practice in that specific skill in the education of the average student at a particular grade level; the levels were broken down into four: grades 7-8; grades 9-10; grades 11-12; grade 13.

3.51 Language Skills

The subsection on language skills asked teachers to evaluate the importance of the three aspects of traditional school grammar (broken down into definition of parts of speech, parsing and identifying grammatical structures and functions, and learning correct usage); descriptive grammar (structural, transformational or systemic); levels of usage and variation according to situation, medium, etc.; regional variation in language; semantics; mechanical skills (spelling and punctuation). Table 3.9 shows the breakdown of the response for each of the three aspects of traditional school grammar.

Table 3.9

DEFINING PARTS OF SPEECH

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	6.7	9.8	25.7	46.2
Fairly important	23.7	38.4	50.9	34.0
Very important	69.7	51.8	23.5	19.8

PARSING

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	14.3	12.9	26.2	46.0
Fairly important	30.5	39.5	45.5	32.0
Very important	55.2	47.6	28.3	22.0

CORRECT USAGE

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	1.7	1.9	3.3	7.7
Fairly important	16.4	12.1	15.9	15.3
Very important	81.9	86.0	80.8	77.0

There are two points to note about these figures. First, there seems to be a decline in the importance attached to both defining parts of speech and parsing through the school years: defining parts of speech is considered very important by 69.7% for grades 7 and 8, 51.8% for grades 9 and 10, 23.5% for grades 11 and 12, and 19.8% for grade 13. Similarly, parsing declines from 55.2% for grades 7 and 8, 47.6% for grade 9 and 10, 28.3% for grades 11 and 12, and 22.0% for grade 13. Learning correct usage on the other hand, remains at a constant high level of importance throughout the years: it is considered very important by 81.9% for grades 7 and 8, 86% for grades 9 and 10, 80.8% for grades 11 and 12, and 77.0% for grade 13.

From this we can infer, either defining the parts of speech and parsing are considered to be more easily learned than correct usage or in less need of reinforcement or that the respondents felt that these skills were less important in the final analysis and that if students had not learned what they needed to learn in the earlier years, then nothing more could be done.

The most startling feature of this data, however, is the extraordinary importance given traditional grammar teaching. If the student-teachers seemed conservative and uninformed in their attitudes, these practising English teachers are even more so. There seems to be little awareness of the immense body of evidence that has been accumulated over the last sixty years concerning the total inefficacy of teaching or learning about traditional grammar in the development of writing abilities. (On this, see Chapter 4). If these responses indicate anything about the amount of time these respondents would devote to teaching these skills, a great deal of the time the Ministry has decreed to be devoted to the teaching of writing skills will clearly be wasted if not worse. For such teaching is not only inefficacious, it is also potentially damaging, teaching students to focus unprofitably on those aspects of the writing which should either be automatic or dealt with at the editing stage. Recent studies of the composing process (Perl 1979, Pianko 1979) suggest that what distinguishes unskilled from skilled writers is their excessive and premature preoccupation with such surface features as usage and spelling.

The attitudes revealed toward the mechanical skills (spelling and punctuation) are consistent with this same limited pedagogic bias (see Table 3.10). Like usage, mechanical skills are considered to be of great importance throughout the intermediate and senior years.

The dangers and limitations of such a bias should be enough to warrant very grave concern, especially on the part of those

Table 3.10

MECHANICAL SKILLS

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	.2	.1	1.6	6.2
Fairly important	14.0	15.3	24.1	22.0
Very important	69.8	84.6	74.3	71.9

Ministry of Education officials responsible for the development, promulgation and implementation of the Intermediate and Senior Guidelines in English. Both those documents assume a conception of writing and its development that is radically opposed to such a narrow and distorted focus. And given the strength of the response on these issues, if the new guidelines are to be enforced in the spirit they were intended, a massive re-education effort will need to be undertaken.

The attitudes suggested by the teachers' responses concerning the relative importance of traditional grammar and mechanical skills are displayed again in their responses to a later section of the questionnaire dealing with attitudes towards aspects of literacy. At that point, when they were asked to indicate which of three positions conformed most closely to their own, the limits of their backgrounds showed through most vividly. Only 4.6% were prepared to say that "training pupils in the principles of traditional 'prescriptive' grammar serves no good purpose, and represents an outdated approach towards developing writing ability." On the other hand, one third of all the respondents (33.6%) could identify with the following extremist position: "Training in the principles of traditional grammar is immensely important for the development of writing abilities. Such training should begin in the early years, and should be reinforced throughout the student's career." The limitations and dangers of such a view have already been mentioned; they will be discussed further in Chapter 4. Even the seemingly more moderate position espoused by the majority (61.8%) of teachers is ill-founded and potentially damaging. To recognize that "young students acquire much of the grammar of their native language naturally" and then to go on to argue that "formal training in traditional grammatical principles, at the appropriate stage of their development, can refine their writing abilities by helping them to use language with precision and clarity" suggests either incomprehension or ignorance of the implications of the research on the development of writing skills, not to speak of an unawareness of all that has gone on in the field of language study in the last twenty-five years.

The traditional section also included a unit on mechanics, consisting of three statements presenting different evaluations of the importance of spelling and punctuation. The first statement reads: "Spelling and punctuation are the least important aspects of writing; the teacher who frequently corrects such errors is likely to discourage the student and impede the development of writing abilities." Only 2.1% of the teachers supported this position. The research findings corroborating the latter statement have only been published since the questionnaire was administered, and so the teachers cannot have been expected to take this work into account, but many of the educationists writing in Britain on the development of writing abilities have been taking such a position for many years now, warning against the easy identification of writing with transcription skills. Unfortunately, the same word "writing" is used to apply both to composing and to transcribing, and too frequently teachers believe they are teaching both when they are only teaching one.

A sizeable minority (44.5%) of teachers took the more moderate position: "Spelling and punctuation are not to be discounted. The teacher should offer the student some training in both." The majority (53.6%), however, were prepared to argue that "Spelling and punctuation have a central place in the spectrum of writing abilities; pupils leaving school must be able to spell correctly and punctuate appropriately."

The other language skills teachers were questioned about are somewhat different. Although the direct relationship between the teaching of descriptive grammar or semantics, for example, and the learning of writing skills has yet to be proved, and in the case of descriptive grammar is somewhat in doubt, nevertheless such teaching at least has the advantage of providing the students with an up-to-date analysis of the language and an appropriate conceptual framework for discussing linguistic issues. And such an awareness of language, whatever its effects on developing writing abilities, may be something to be desired in its own right and is certainly so defined by the Ministry Guidelines.

The teachers were considerably less enthusiastic in their evaluation of the relative importance of these other language skills, although a substantial body did recognize their value. Or at least, so it seemed from their responses. Given the radical misunderstanding of such terms as systemic grammar by some student-teachers (who presumably interpreted it to mean systematic, and thus perhaps traditional, grammar) one hesitates to make much of these results. The following, for example, is the response given to the questions concerning descriptive grammar which had been defined as structural, transformational, or systemic.

Table 3.11

DESCRIPTIVE GRAMMAR

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	19.6	15.1	22.0	31.2
Fairly important	37.4	43.9	41.4	35.5
Very important	43.4	41.0	36.6	33.4

Given the small proportion of teachers who reported taking undergraduate courses in linguistics or language study, given that almost half were educated beforethe revolutionary developments in linguistics of the past twenty years, one wonders whether the high value attached to "grammar" (which, for most, means traditional grammar) did not spill over into the response on this question.

In the same way, part of the response to the question on levels of usage may have been affected by a basic misinterpretation and by confusing "levels of usage" with "correct usage."

Table 3.12

LEVELS OF USAGE

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	20.2	6.3	5.7	8.0
Fairly important	37.6	45.4	30.5	25.5
Very important	42.2	48.4	63.8	66.5

The importance of teaching this skill is considered to be significantly less, in the eyes of our respondents, than the teaching of correct usage; nevertheless, if so large a body of practising English teachers as our figures indicate do in fact recognize the value in discussing usage in terms of context and medium, that would be a good sign. What makes such a conclusion less likely is the response concerning the importance of teaching regional variation in language.

The difference in the response to the two topics, levels of usage and regional variation, and the similarity in approach each

Table 3.13

REGIONAL VARIATION

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	65.7	60.2	48.7	45.2
Fairly important	26.3	30.9	37.9	38.6
Very important	8.0	9.0	13.4	16.2

implies suggest that perhaps many of the teachers have in fact misinterpreted the question.

3.52 Relation of Undergraduate Training to Evaluations

In order to determine whether the undergraduate courses teachers were able to take during their training correlated at all with their subsequent evaluation of different aspects of the English curriculum, a series of crosstabulations were run on all the questions asking about the relative importance of different skills, comparing teachers who had taken certain kinds of courses with those who had not. We selected, first, teachers who had taken courses in Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, and/or the History of the English Language; second, those who had taken courses in the structure of Modern English and/or Survey of Grammatical Theories; and third, those who had taken Composition or Rhetoric. The results of all these comparisons have been tabulated in Tables 3.14-3.24.

Traditional Grammar

Broadly speaking, there are no startling differences between any of the domains. Teachers who have taken courses in the History of the Language group think defining parts of speech to be less important for grades 11-13 (the difference for 11-12 is 12.27% as compared to 21.97%) and parsing less important for grades 9-13 (with the greatest difference at the 11-12 level, 13.88% compared to 26.41%). While a lower number consider learning correct usage to be very important for 9-10 (67.74% to 72.87%), a much higher number consider it very important in grade 13 (44.75% to 28.27%).

About 4% more of the teachers who had taken courses in modern English or Grammatical Theories felt defining parts of speech to be very important at the 7-8 level, while the same percentage considered it to be less so at the 9-10 level. The one relatively large difference lies in the percentage who consider it relatively unimportant at grade 13 - 45.68% of the selected group as opposed to 36.25% of the rest of the population.

There are two differences of note between the selected group and the population in their emphasis on parsing. The first is the percentage who considered that skill unimportant: 15.56% and 50.97% for the selected group in 11-12 and 13 contrasted to 24.40% and 35.76% for the population. A second difference is that far more of the selected group considered such a skill fairly important for all the levels except 13.

As to learning correct usage, a progressively larger percentage of the selected group considered this skill very important through the levels, reaching a difference of 20% in grade 13 (82.07% to 62.61%).

The difference, then, between teachers who had taken these various language courses and the rest of the population do not amount to much; there are differences in both directions and so, on the whole, the effect of each is cancelled out.

Those teachers who had taken courses in composition and rhetoric, however, show themselves consistently to be somewhat more conservative than the rest of the population, assigning a slightly greater degree of importance to all three parts of traditional grammar.

Table 3.14

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF DEFINING PARTS OF SPEECH

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, and/or History of the English Language with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	7.22	17.88	55.13
	Rest of population	4.88	18.55	55.42
9-10	Selected group	7.22	41.39	46.36
	Rest of population	8.37	34.59	48.99
11-12	Selected group	15.97	63.58	12.27
	Rest of population	23.35	41.83	21.97
13	Selected group	37.12	32.61	13.99
	Rest of population	36.80	26.23	17.27

Table 3.15

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PARSING

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, and/or History of the English Language with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	11.68	22.10	44.99
	Rest of population	11.19	23.00	44.16
9-10	Selected group	11.60	39.42	40.21
	Rest of population	11.38	36.44	44.46
11-12	Selected group	28.78	44.87	13.88
	Rest of population	23.43	38.60	26.41
13	Selected group	40.96	30.31	10.39
	Rest of population	36.31	25.62	19.15

Table 3.16

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING CORRECT USAGE

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, and/or History of the English Language with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	1.67	14.05	79.54
	Rest of population	1.48	11.94	78.77
9-10	Selected group	1.67	24.18	67.74
	Rest of population	3.01	13.35	72.87
11-12	Selected group	9.89	11.75	63.85
	Rest of population	5.61	12.36	63.78
13	Selected group	13.26	20.58	44.75
	Rest of population	12.81	24.90	28.27

Table 3.17

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF DEFINING PARTS OF SPEECH

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Structure of Modern English or Survey of Grammatical Theories with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	4.84	21.84	59.17
	Rest of population	5.08	18.28	55.15
9-10	Selected group	4.84	48.24	45.20
	Rest of population	8.50	34.29	49.01
11-12	Selected group	21.60	56.44	18.96
	Rest of population	22.83	42.75	21.34
13	Selected group	45.68	31.68	17.91
	Rest of population	36.25	26.42	16.95

Table 3.18

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PARSING

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Structure of Modern English or Survey of Grammatical Theories with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	7.55	35.75	45.57
	Rest of population	11.46	22.10	44.14
9-10	Selected group	7.81	45.62	44.85
	Rest of population	11.63	36.10	44.07
11-12	Selected group	15.56	54.80	26.64
	Rest of population	24.40	38.09	25.33
13	Selected group	50.97	23.08	21.23
	Rest of population	35.76	26.19	18.26

Table 3.19

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING CORRECT USAGE

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Structure of Modern English or Survey of Grammatical Theories with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	00	18.82	67.05
	Rest of population	1.22	12.17	65.54
9-10	Selected group	00	9.31	85.97
	Rest of population	1.59	12.29	78.37
11-12	Selected group	00	14.72	85.28
	Rest of population	3.09	14.19	71.63
13	Selected group	6.51	9.69	82.07
	Rest of population	5.92	12.48	62.61

Table 3.20

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF DEFINING PARTS OF SPEECH

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Composition and Rhetoric with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	3.91	16.76	58.62
	Rest of population	5.16	18.63	55.14
9-10	Selected group	3.91	41.21	53.10
	Rest of population	8.63	34.64	48.43
11-12	Selected group	19.52	47.05	28.29
	Rest of population	23.02	43.30	20.62
13	Selected group	34.35	34.82	21.55
	Rest of population	37.02	26.08	16.64

Table 3.21

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PARSING

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Composition and Rhetoric with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	8.78	25.51	47.45
	Rest of population	11.42	22.72	43.95
9-10	Selected group	8.32	44.00	47.69
	Rest of population	11.65	36.08	43.83
11-12	Selected group	25.64	31.64	39.16
	Rest of population	23.72	39.71	24.29
13	Selected group	42.73	24.13	25.43
	Rest of population	36.19	26.16	17.88

Table 3.22

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING CORRECT USAGE

Comparison of Teachers who have taken Undergraduate Courses in Composition and Rhetoric with the Rest of the Population of English Teachers

		Relatively unimportant	Fairly important	Very important
7-8	Selected group	00	13.99	66.18
	Rest of population	1.24	12.46	65.58
9-10	Selected group	00	7.34	92.66
	Rest of population	1.62	12.50	77.71
11-12	Selected group	3.11	17.16	76.17
	Rest of population	2.88	13.98	72.15
13	Selected group	10.84	11.58	69.86
	Rest of population	5.56	12.37	63.29

Table 3.23

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EXPOSITION

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	11.9	1.4	0.9	1.2
Fairly important	32.5	34.2	11.6	10
Very important	55.6	64.3	87.4	88.8

Table 3.24

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF POETIC WRITING

	7-8	9-10	11-12	13
Relatively unimportant	26.5	25.9	26.8	32.3
Fairly important	50.2	49.8	49.8	43.9
Very important	23.3	24.3	23.4	23.7

When questioned as to the relative importance attached to practice in and teaching of writing skills according to the major modes (poetic, expressive, expository), the English teachers as a whole ascribed a very high importance to exposition in general and remarkably little to poetic writing. Exposition is considerd very important by 55% of the teachers for grades 7 and 8, by 64% for 9-10, and by over 87% for 11, 12, and 13. At the same time, those who consider it unimportant decline from 11.9% for grades 7-8, to 1% or less for grades 9 through 13. The importance or lack of importance given poetic writing remains fairly constant through the years, with about 23-25% considering it very important and about 26% considering it unimportant (until grade 13 when that figure rises to 32%).

These figures give the lie to the popular perception, cultivated by the media, of the mood and temperament of English teachers and of the kind of teaching that consequently goes on in the classrooms. According to the popular myth, the focus of English teaching in the past decade has been on creative writing (what we have called poetic writing, the writing of poems, stories, plays) at the expense of "basic skills" and exposition. And the supposed decline of literacy is often attributed to just such an emphasis. On the basis of their responses to this questionnaire, the teachers show themselves to be as committed to the development of expository skills as the public would want them to be and probably as hostile to creative expression.

This bias is further evidenced in the teachers' responses to the section of the questionnaire dealing with attitudes towards literacy. One question differentiates among rival (although not always mutually exclusive) conceptions of English teaching; the respondents were asked to indicate the position that conformed most closely to their own. The first, adapted from a statement by David Holbrook in English for the Rejected, argues the case for creativity in English, specifically for the disadvantaged student. Although the argument is made moderately and lucidly without the stridency sometimes characteristic of proponents of this position which might alienate persons otherwise sympathetic, only 22% identified this position as close to their own:

> "For the rejected student, for students whose backgrounds neither prepare them to benefit from schools as they are usually organized nor help to advance them socially - for such students English, as a creative subject, can be a focus for reparative human contact. By encouraging students' own innate creativity in personal writing, the English teacher can bring them to that engagement with great literature which alone can protect them against the world of dehumanization."

Almost the same percentage (17.6%) identified with the aggressive stance taken against such a position in the following statement adapted from Shayer (1972).

> "Teaching writing by means of creative methodologies merely leaves children to circle endlessly in a colorful abundance of their own unchecked spontaneity. Basic skills such as spelling, punctuation, sentence structure and style are not merely put second to actual writing, but are ignored almost to the point of disappearing. This leaves students stewing in their own unformed linguistic juices - to nobody's advantage."

The majority of teachers (59.9%), while acknowledging children's innate creativity, felt that such creativity must be carefully "channelled" and shaped to "work its effects within acceptable or conventional limits" by means of "carefully structured teaching."

This insistence on structure and discipline in teaching and the suspicion of creative methodologies is consistent with the impression of teachers' attitudes suggested by the relative importance they assigned the various language and writing related skills.

Similarly their response to the attitudinal question about the value of literacy reveals them to be other than what the press and public accuse them of being. Only 0.4% would argue that "in the modern "audio-visual world, writing is becoming less and less important in the practical day-to-day life of the average citizen" and that "unless a pupil is eager to acquire writing abilities, the teacher should not give undue attention to their development." And only 16.4% espouse the far more moderate position, recognizing the value of writing but cautioning against overemphasis. "In recent years the basic writing skills have been underemphasized in the school system. The pendulum has swung too far; the schools should place more emphasis on writing abilities, but should be careful not to overemphasize their importance."

The position that is espoused by the great majority (83.2%) of these English teachers reveals a whole-hearted and unqualified commitment to the development of the skills associated with literacy.

> "It is essential that citizens should be able to read and write adequately. Practical considerations are not the only issue; the citizen who lacks skills in reading and writing is at the mercy of the political system, and is also deprived of enjoying many benefits of his cultural heritage. The importance of training students to read intelligently and to write well cannot be overemphasized."

3.6 Conclusion

The responses of the teachers to these explicitly attitudinal questions shows that it is necessary to treat their evaluations of aspects of their own training with some caution. If Ontario teachers are on the whole not positively disposed towards their professional education, they are nonetheless in part products of it: witness the value ascribed by them to their undergraduate training in English literature (Table 3.8), which for many of them was the most important single aspect of all their professional education. What we see in the responses to the Survey of Practising Teachers as a whole is the same set of key problems that appear in the discussion of the student questionnaire: problems of knowledge, in the first place; and in the second place problems relating to the structures within which Ontario's teachers are trained.

CONCLUSION

4.1 Key Problem Areas

The three surveys undertaken for this Project suggest that there are five key problem areas that need to be discussed in relation to the training of teachers to teach writing in Ontario. The first of these is, simply, writing: what is known about the acquisition and development of writing abilities, especially as a result of research conducted during the last decade; what teachers need to know about this research and its implications for their work in schools; how this information can best be imparted both to student teachers and to practising teachers. The second problem area is the place of expository writing in relation to the whole spectrum of writing skills. The third is the question of grammar teaching as it relates to the teaching of writing. Discussion of these topics is complicated because of the cultural value imputed to them, and the heavy aura of myth which surrounds them as result. The culturally imparted beliefs are deeply entrenched and pervasive, so that any change in teachers' attitudes and practices may be difficult to effect and difficult to maintain. This then is the fourth problem area. The fifth is the structures within which teacher training takes place. This emerged as a problem in all the surveys; within it, practice teaching proved to be particularly problematic.

Each of these areas is potentially vast - too vast, certainly, for detailed discussion even in a report of the length and scope of this one. Nonetheless, in order to provide a context for the recommendations which emerge from the surveys and our analysis of their results, it is necessary to summarize something of our views of each of these areas, and to point to some of the research which has shaped those views.

4.11 Writing

Current approaches to the study of the nature of writing and to the teaching of writing may be loosely divided into three schools. First there is the traditional view, labelled by Richard Young (1978) the "current-traditional paradigm." The outstanding feature of this view of writing is that it begins with the analysis of the properties of the finished piece of writing, and makes that the basis of a pedagogy which specifies stages that are supposed to effect the creation of such a product. The other two views, by contrast, start from the process by which a piece of writing is created. That, however, is all that they have in common. One approach stresses pedagogical techniques which address specific skills that are, or are assumed to be, part of the whole process. Characteristically, therefore, writers in this school see the teaching of writing as the attempt to influence writing behaviour by means of carefully controlled tasks. The third approach tends to rely much more heavily on inherent linguistic abilities, and concentrates on providing occasions for those abilities to be as productive as possible. In this school the view of the writing process is much more comprehensive, and writing tends to be situated much more explicitly in the personal, sociological and linguistic contexts in which the act of writing takes place.

The current-traditional view of writing is the one in which we were all immersed in our own education. It is the theoretical foundation of the familiar handbooks of rhetoric which are still widely used, with, typically, their discussion of narrowing the topic, formulating a thesis statement, devising an outline and their attention to characteristic rhetorical patterns (comparison and contrast, cause and effect, etc.), the unified paragraph, transitional devices, and so on. Despite the fact that it continues to be so pervasive, this view of writing has been thoroughly superseded. Its key problem is precisely that it directs attention to the finished product, for its view that the analysis of the finished product provides a basis for helping students to learn to write is simply not supported by the available empirical evidence. For example, when Janet Emig surveyed a large number of professional writers, she found that they do not necessarily go through the stage of constructing an outline before they begin to write (Emig, 1971). This testimony is supported by the testimony of introspective artists such as Donald Murray who, in his descriptions of what he himself does when he writes, reveals a process which is quite different from that envisaged by the traditional handbooks of rhetoric (Murray, 1978, 1980). Similarly the growing body of research reporting on observations of what students do as they write (Flower and Hayes

1980 a and b, Hayes and Flower 1979 and in press, Perl 1979, Perl and Egendorf 1979, Pianko 1977 and 1979) confirms that the focus on the product is misguided.

The weakness of the current-traditional approach from a pedagogical point of view is that it does not pay sufficient attention to the earlier, creative stages of the writing process. All the research that has accumulated in the last decade and more confirms that the calibre of the finished piece of writing depends first, and crucially, on the quality of the earlier stages of the process. And this is particularly the case in the school context, where it is important that writing be seen as one of the available modes of thinking and learning instead of a way of allowing teachers to check what has been learned (or, perhaps, copied). Moreover, precisely because it directs attention away from the earlier stages of the composing process, the current-traditional approach does not take advantage of the wealth of pedagogical techniques which have grown out of the research on the writing process. Yet there is a sizable body of evidence that such techniques are much more effective in bringing about the development of writing abilities.

In the approaches to writing which address particular skills, one stands out at the moment both for the strength of the empirical research examining its effects and for its relatively widespread use: the technique known as sentence combining. In its simplest form, sentence combining provides student writers with sets of very simple sentences and instructs them to combine them according to particular patterns which may either be specified or modelled. In other forms, the instruction or modelling is not provided, and students are left to find their own ways of combining the simpler sentences into more complex wholes. In advanced forms, the attention can shift to combining sentences to form paragraphs and even longer pieces of discourse, and simultaneously the attention to the rhetorical effects of different possibilities may be brought to the fore.

Historically, sentence combining has its origins in the attempts to assess the effects of teaching transformational grammar on writing abilities (Mellon, 1967), but the distinction of demonstrating that the effects demonstrated by Mellon were actually due to practice in sentence combining rather than to instruction in grammar belongs to Frank O'Hare (1973). All in all, the research evidence for the effectiveness of sentence combining is now very clear; headed by O'Hare's work, it is the subject of a vast literature which is surveyed, catalogued and extended in Daiker, Kerek and Morenberg 1979a. At the present time, there are a large number of sets of text materials available for the teaching of sentence combining at various levels, including O'Hare (1975), Strong (1973) and Daiker, Kerek and Morenberg (1979b). In addition there are some recent materials which apply sentence combining techniques at levels beyond the sentence level, such as Memering and O'Hare (1980) and Strong (1980). The research base for these extensions of sentence combining has not yet been published.

Similar to sentence combining is the technique of sentence expansion known as generative rhetoric, which is associated above all with Francis Christensen. Like sentence combining, generative rhetoric focusses on syntactic operations at the sentence level, and indeed it strongly favours particular kinds of sentence structures characterized by what are known in the literature in this area as free modifiers. Again like sentence combining, it has been extended to the level of the paragraph. However whereas sentence combining exercises provide the content of the sentences and challenge the students to explore the effects or at least the possibility of different kinds of syntactic manipulation, Christensenian generative rhetoric typically invites them to generate their own content as well as to explore the possibilities of syntactic manipulation. The theoretical justification for this approach is presented in Christensen (1967) and there is a fairly extensive literature reporting on the effectiveness of Christensen's techniques, although the empirical support is by no means as extensive as is the case with sentence combining. The major teaching work is The Christensen Rhetoric Program (Christensen and Munson 1968).

A third technique which is closely allied to sentence combining is that of Anne Obenchain. The difference is that Obenchain adds to that part of her instructional material which is essentially sentence combining a set of highly cued instructions for sentence production and manipulation which is very heavily influenced by the current-traditional view of what constitutes good writing and by traditional grammar. The empirical consideration of the effectiveness of Obenchain's techniques is much less even than that dealing with Christensenian rhetoric and far less than that for sentence combining: essentially the theoretical discussion and empirical validation is restricted to Obenchain's M.A. thesis (Obenchain 1971). The teaching material is available in two volumes (Obenchain, 1976, 1977).

Also related to sentence combining, and also highly idiosyncratic, is the work of Willis Pitkin, which he calls "hierarchical base combining." It may be regarded as an amalgam of the syntactic construction technique of sentence combining and the levels-of-generalization notion in Christensenian rhetoric. However whereas sentence combining has, as its classroom content, sentence manipulation at the syntactic level, in Pitkin's work the focus is on the semantic relations which may hold between two sentences or propositions, or indeed discourse blocks of any size. Thus Pitkin's technique concentrates on a different stage (or perhaps a different level) of the writing process from that which is the concern in sentence combining. Like sentence combining, however, it concentrates on one small part of the whole operation, and gives students copious practice in it. The theoretical justification for Pitkin's approach is presented in Pitkin 1977 a and b. No empirical validation of the technique has ever been published, although Pitkin is reported to have conducted such a study (cf. Mellon 1979). The teaching material is available in an undated workbook (Pitkin, no date). It is the judgment of one authority that "even students as mature as college freshmen may not sit still for" Pitkin's material, so complicated is it (Mellon 1979:9).

Quite distinct from all these except in that they are also addressing particular stages in the writing process are the pedagogical strategies devised by Carl Bereiter and Marlene Scardamalia and their associates as part of the distinguished "Pedagogy of Writing" Project being conducted at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Although a full presentation of the empirical validation of this material has not yet been published, it has in fact been tested extensively in research which is formally superior even to most if not all of that devoted to sentence combining. Some of the validation is described briefly in a forthcoming article (Bereiter and Scardamalia, forthcoming b), and the same article gives a comprehensive statement of the theoretical justification of the approach. A draft version of the pedagogical material derived from this part of the Pedagogy of Writing Project is available (Scardamalia, Bereiter and Fillion, 1979). At this stage of the project, the research team has identified five areas within the writing process for which they have devised specific pedagogical techniques: generating text without the aid of a conversational partner; conducting an active but unaided search for content; engaging in whole-text planning; functioning as one's own reader; and revising texts at various levels. For most of these a number of classroom exercises have been devised in order to give students practice in these specific skills.

It may appear to be the case that such pedagogical techniques as sentence combining, Christensen rhetoric, and the cognitively oriented tasks devised by the OISE Pedagogy of Writing team are compatible with the current-traditional approach. However it is clear from their various presentations of their theoretical foundations that, with the possible exception of Obenchain, those working in this field do not see themselves as sharing that approach at all. Rather, they relate to the third approach.

This approach is the most radical in its opposition to the assumptions and methodologies of current-traditional rhetoric. We have tried elsewhere to clarify its stance with respect to the traditional approach (Freedman and Pringle 1980). For convenience, we will call this third school the "Writing Process" approach. The very extensive literature relating to it from the U.K. includes the work of the Schools Council Project on the Development of Writing Abilities 11-18 (Britton et al 1975), the antecedent work of the London Association of Teachers of English (represented for example by Barnes et al, 1969), the whole "Language Across the Curriculum" movement (e.g. Barnes 1973, 1976, Marland 1977) and the special development of that movement in such works as Martin et al's Writing and Learning across the Curriculum 11-16 (1976). Most of the current theoretical work in North America also relates explicitly to this same approach: the work of James Moffett, the research of the Writing Process Laboratory of the University of New Hampshire directed by Donald Graves and, with varying differences of emphasis, the work of the Bay Area Writing Project of the University of California, Berkeley, the numerous theorists represented in Research on Composing (Cooper and Odell, 1978), Linguistics, Stylistics and the Teaching of Composition (McQuade, 1979), and Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition (Freedman and Pringle, 1980), and so on.

The scope of this change in orientation is massive. Areas called on in the course of the empirical investigations of the writing process vary from discourse analysis to tagmemic linguistics to cognitive and experimental psychology; theoretical justificationsare sought in fields as different as classical rhetoric and the psychology of creativity. Those working in this school have been concerned perhaps to an unusual degree to explore and clarify the theoretical foundations of their work; such studies therefore are themselves the subject of a considerable bibliography (cf. Emig 1980, Park 1980). The empirical investigations which buttress the approach have also been massive in their scope and thoroughness (though not impervious to occasional attacks); they continue to accumulate.

The nature of the approach, however, is such that it does not lend itself to simply specified practical techniques which can easily be passed on to practising teachers. Rather, it requires a totally new orientation on the part of teachers, and a willingness to jettison teaching habits that may have been built up in the course of much of a professional lifetime in favour of techniques which are not only radically different but may also seem at first sight to be naively romantic. (As Rosen and Rosen [1973:225] comment, "the less you concern yourself with how children learn, the easier it is to produce a system.") Nonetheless, the accumulated evidence shows that this kind of approach to the teaching of writing is enormously successful, not only in terms of the quality of the product, but also (and to most of those working in the field this is still more important) in the quality of the intellectual and emotional engagement during the writing process and, as a result, in the quality of the learning that takes place because of and through the experience of writing.

Not surprisingly, the results of both the student and the practising teacher surveys suggest that prospective and practising teachers are equally imbued with the current traditional approach to the teaching of writing. Although obviously there has been ongoing professional development work since the time of the surveys as part of the implementation of the Intermediate and Senior Guidelines, our own work with teachers at various levels across the province and the evidence of those of our colleagues in various jurisdictions who are concerned with in-service education of teachers, with preparation of curricular materials for use in schools, and with surveying on behalf of the Ministry the responses to the new guidelines and support documents all suggest that a massive task of re-education is required, just as much now as it was in 1977. Certainly it is clear from surveys conducted in Toronto (Fillion, 1979 ; McTeague et al, 1981) and Ottawa

(Walker and Fitchett, 1979) that the amount of writing going on in schools, at least in the jurisdictions investigated, is far less than the new guidelines envisage, and different as well in kind, in that almost all the writing that takes place is either copying or short answers to specific questions.

We believe that, if the new guidelines are to bring about the improvements which are their goal, and which all available research suggests they should be able to effect, then teachers have to be brought to understand firstly, how much they themselves may be influenced unknowingly by the current-traditional paradigm; secondly, what research has shown about the limitations of that paradigm; thirdly, what is now known about the writing process, and the implications of that knowledge for what teachers do in their classrooms; fourthly, the strengths (and also the potential weaknesses) of at least the major techniques for developing specific skills which can be drawn on in a process approach to writing in schools; and lastly, as many pedagogical strategies as possible for allowing a process oriented practice of writing in schools.

Clearly what is involved in no small task. One day - even one week - workshops are not enough. Without intensive and preferably formal re-education, however, there is every reason to suppose that the intentions of the new guidelines will be subverted; that teachers, believing they are carrying out the intentions of the guidelines, will instead revert to the way of teaching writing which derives from their own experience. This will almost certainly be a set of techniques whose only theoretical justification is in the current-traditional paradigm.

This, then, is our view of the theoretical background of the first of the key problem areas.

4.12 Expository Writing in the Schools

One of the pervasive problems in this study has been the attempt to restrict its focus to expository writing. This is problematic in the first place because expository writing simply cannot be separated from the larger context of the development of writing abilities. There is good reason to think that Britton (1978) is right in his claim that the best foundation for the writing of exposition (what he calls the "transactional" mode) is the experience of writing in the "expressive" mode. Furthermore, expressive writing is not just a stage in the development of the individual writer but should also be a stage in the development of each piece of writing. A good expository essay emerges out of a context of a great deal of expressive writing exploring the same material. Expressive writing, then, is not something to be outgrown (like, say, printing). Rather it should continue to be elicited along with expository writing throughout the elementary and secondary years. Partly for these reasons, our colleagues in the Faculties were sometimes critical of the attempt to narrow the scope of the study to expository writing and sometimes, in their responses to our questions, found it impossible to do so themselves. Consequently much of this report addresses the larger question of the training of teachers to teach writing generally rather than to teach exposition alone.

4.13 Grammar Teaching

Within the whole field of writing, grammar and the teaching of grammar come to be a particular issue. It is clear from both the student teacher and the practising teacher surveys that generally speaking, attitudes towards the teaching of grammar are extremely conservative, and totally uninformed. Even in the Faculty survey there are suggestions that some of the basic reseach in this area either is not known as widely as it should be, or is not taken as seriously as it ought to be.

Since the whole area is so prickly and so subject to misunderstanding, it will be as well to be clear about the meaning we intend by the term we use. Traditional grammar, as we are using it in this discussion, is the traditional school grammar of the English-speaking world. It has its origins in the grammatical tradition established in Greek by Dionysios Thrax, as it was adapted to Latin by Quintilian and Priscian, among others, and subsequently codified for second-language teaching purposes by such writers as Donatus. Its history in English begins with Renaissance Latin grammars of English such as Ben Jonson's, but it begins to be established as a pedagogical tradition only in the late eighteenth century. In historical terms the most important of the works produced at that time are Robert Lowth's Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762) and Lindley Murray's

English Grammar (1795), which became the models of, and indeed in large measure the sources for, almost all the major pedagogical grammars used in the English speaking world before about 1950. In the United States, the tradition was passed on in an adapted form for which Noah Webster's Grammatical Institute of the English Language (1784) was the intermediary. In Canada the intermediary was partly Webster and partly the grammars produced for use in Ontario schools by Egerton Ryerson. In the United Kingdom the tradition was revived by J.C. Nesfield's Manual of English Grammar and Composition (1898). The tradition which was passed on by these works lives on today in such texts as Mastering Effective English and a surprising number of newly written school textbooks; it can be seen surviving even in such works as the Nelson "Language Matters" series, which in most respects are so radical and innovative in their approach to language study in schools.

Essentially, what is called grammar in this tradition has two parts. The first is the definition of parts of speech and the structures of which they may be part, up to the level of the sentence. The second is a fairly extensive set of rules, most of them first formulated in the eighteenth century, for what is called good usage. It has come to be something of a commonplace in discussions of grammar for student teachers to suggest that an eclectic approach to grammatical theory is justifiable. So it is, no doubt. But too often, this claim is taken to mean that traditional grammar can still have a place in the classroom. It needs to be stressed as strongly as possible that this is not the case. Particularly in the antecedent, analytic part of its treatment of English, traditional grammar is simply wrong. It takes what was already an epistemologically incoherent ragbag of tradition, and adapts it clumsily to a language which it does not fit. But that it does not fit has been clear almost from the beginning (one of the more vehement attacks on traditional grammar was written by William Hazlitt), and is simply not subject to reasonable doubt. One of the clearest of the numerous modern demonstrations of its inadequacy is that of W. Nelson Francis (1964). The new Guidelines, rightly in our view, recommend Quirk and Greenbaum's University Grammar of English as a fundamental reference work for teachers. This, and the closely related works by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1972), by Close (1975) and Leech and Svartvik (1975) are the only modern comprehensive grammars of English which are intellectually defensible. They are not traditional grammars, however. They draw extensively and comprehensively on linguistically oriented research into the English language which has been continuing since the establishment of the school tradition, but for various reasons has hardly ever been reflected in that tradition. (Some of the reasons for this are discussed in Pringle, 1976). To the uninitiated, traditional grammar and the kind of grammar represented in Quirk and Greenbaum may seem to be somewhat alike. Really, all that they have in common is some of their terminology. In the same way, the eighteenth century phlogiston theory of combustion, which held that combustion is the escape of phlogiston from combustible materials, may seem to have something in common with the description of combustion propounded in modern physics and chemistry. In reality, however, all that the two theories have in common is that both talk about combustion and combustible materials. Otherwise they have nothing in common. And just as the phlogiston theory of combustion should have no place in our schools, so we believe that traditional grammar should have no place in our schools.

This applies, moreover, not only to that part of grammar which is devoted to the analysis of the language but also to that part which is concerned with specifying rules of good usage. This area, however, is a great deal more complicated. What constitutes Standard English is properly a matter that can be determined by means of sociolinguistic investigations. This does not mean, of course, that whatever is said by someone somewhere is for that reason standard. It means that it is possible to describe certain features of English which are common to the English of all those who, for whatever reasons, can be regarded as the best users of English. By and large, this means the English of professional edited publications and of premeditated oral discourse intended for an audience rather than an interactive listener. The complicating factor which is thrown in, in the case of English, is that many of the practices which traditional grammar regards as the only admissible correct form are in fact not standard, or not the only standard. In many matters of divided usage, responsible users of the language choose both alternatives, sometimes for particular reasons, sometimes simply randomly. It is not surprising that this should be so: the investigations of linguists over the last two decades have revealed that natural languages have quite a large measure of tolerance of inherent variability. Moreover there is nothing that can be done about that fact at the societal level, since there is no known way of making the users of a language change what they do when they write and speak unreflectingly. Unfortunately, however, many of those who in their practice already exemplify standard usage have come to believe, thanks to their education, that the unique "correct" forms are in fact the only standard forms even if they themselves use both forms, or only the "incorrect" form. This peculiar situation has two effects which are important in education. The first is that it has led to the creation of what might be called a superstandard form of the language (Wolfram and Fasold 1974:17-23): a form which is better than standard (and is therefore a special case of non-standard), which has no other function than to be a goal for language teaching in schools. The second is that those who know what the "correct" forms are (including, sometimes, teachers) can feel justified in drawing attention to a student's use of "incorrect" forms even if they would be fully acceptable in any context other than the school context. Consequently, educated users of English have a fairly high level of awareness of what the "correct" forms are. They may choose not to use them themselves. Or they may believe that they use them, but not do so in fact. (This is probably the most common situation.) Or they may know that they do not use them, and nonetheless believe that others use the language "better" when they do. It is this phenomenon which justifies the common label of shibboleths for such matters of divided usage: those in the know can call on them at any moment in order to make judgments about other users of the language.

In reality, of course, most people are sensitive only to a dozen or so matters of good usage. But one person's favorite twelve are not necessarily the same as the next person's. There are over 300 points of disputed usage which are discussed or ruled on in various dictionaries and handbooks of usage, and there is probably no one in the whole English-speaking world who is sensitive to all of them. Moreover it has been demonstrated very clearly that even in the various handbooks of usage which deal with such matters, there is in the first place no consensus as to what the incorrect forms are (for no two handbooks agree completely even on the list of points of disputed usage that they choose to discuss), nor as to which "incorrect" forms are acceptable (for no two authorities agree completely in their rulings) (Cresswell, 1975). Nor is there any obvious way to justify a claim that some one authority is somehow sounder than others (for example Fowler, or for Canadian purposes Avis), because all of them can be shown to be arbitrary and capricious in their individual choices of what is to be proscribed and what is to be admitted. Fowler, for example, uses the Oxford English Dictionary to justify his ruling that plural forms are acceptable after none (a fact which was apparently unknown to those who devised the Waterloo Test of English). However Fowler refuses to consider comparable testimony from the Oxford English Dictionary concerning the use of they and their after indefinite singular forms such as anyone, and the only possible explanation for this inconsistency seems to be that Fowler was prepared to tolerate none are but was not prepared to tolerate anyone . . . their.

It is specifically to this tradition that we refer when we refer to traditional grammar. There are other schools of grammar, notably the structural school, the transformational-grammar school (or rather schools) and the systemic school. Discussions of grammar for teachers sometimes seem to suggest that these are alternatives to each other, to one of which one must declare allegiance. In reality, however, they are not. Rather they are complementary. They start from different theoretical presuppositions, and, partly for that reason, use different methodologies to reach their conclusions and present their analyses. Specifically, transformational grammar grew out of the successful demonstration of the formal mathematical properties of English (Chomsky 1957) and the theory of language, and especially of language acquisition, which followed from that demonstration. Partly for this reason, transformational generative grammars of English have characteristically been much concerned with linguistic theory. For theoretical reasons they tend also to be concerned with native speakers' judgements of what is intuitively acceptable. As a result they have focused above all on areas of English which are either particularly interesting for theoretical reasons, or evoke particularly complex judgments. They have not yet been concerned to produce a comprehensive grammar of English which could be used as a reference work. The most comprehensive work in this school (Stockwell, Schachter and Partee, 1973), for example, does not discuss adverbs at all, and no transformational grammar of English has had any success in dealing with something that is as fundamental in English as the ordering of modifiers before nouns (which, for example, forces us to say "two sweet little old ladies" rather than "little two old sweet ladies"). On the other hand, structural grammars of English have been far more successful at analysing and classifying the surface structures of English, but they have done so at the cost of enormous complexity, and at the same time have obscured relationships which transformational grammar analyses very elegantly and convincingly. And so on.

It is precisely for this reason, of course, that it has become traditional in discussions of teacher training to assert that English teachers should be eclectic in their approach to grammar. However it is not clear whether there is any justification for teaching any kind of grammar, at least in relation to writing.

The evidence that teaching the analytic aspect of traditional grammar has no beneficial effects on writing ability is very strong. The key studies are Macaulay 1947 and Elley et al 1975. The Elley study, which confirms the results of many earlier studies, including Macaulay's , shows with very great clarity that there were no significant differences between the writing of students who were taught a course of traditional grammar and the writing of a very carefully matched group of students who were taught no grammar at all. Macaulay had already suggested one possible reason for this: that traditional grammar is simply too difficult for all but the most advanced secondary level students. In view of the incoherence of the tradition, this seems very likely. Certainly it is fairly easy to demonstrate that what students do when they succeed in identifying parts of speech after having been taught the traditional definitions is necessarily unrelated to what they have been taught (cf. Francis 1964, Pringle 1976). What this means is that those who succeed in identifying parts of speech after having been taught traditional grammar must have developed their own strategies to identify them. Small wonder then that only the intellectual elite should succeed.

But even beyond this point there is another, and that is simply this. Even if the grammar that was taught was empirically justified and within the reach of the cognitive abilities of the students who were taught it, there is no more reason to suppose that knowing such a grammar would improve their writing abilities than there is to suppose that knowing the physics of riding a bicycle would help them to ride a bike. Clearly most of those who know how to ride a bicycle do so in complete ignorance of any of the relevant physical laws. That something like that is true also of the relation between the teaching of grammar and the improvement of writing abilities is also suggested by Elley et al (1975). For in addition to testing for the effects of teaching traditional grammar, Elley and his colleagues tested for the effect of teaching a course of transformational grammar which is intellectually defensible (namely the Oregon Curriculum, Kitzhaber 1974) and once again were able to detect no significant effect on the quality of the writing produced.

Admittedly such evidence flies in the face of Vygotsky's claim that language development should include a "scientific" or analytic knowledge, a kind of knowledge which some think would influence the development of writing ability. And certainly it is possible that the kind of intensive instruction in an empirically defensible grammar of English surface structures, such as H.A. Gleason has advocated for many years, might have the kind of carry-over effect on writing abilities that he suggests would ensue. The differences between what would have to be taught as grammar in such circumstances (say, the kind of teaching grammar that might be based on Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973) and what is taught as grammar both in traditional grammar and also in the Oregon Curriculum's transformational grammar are so great that it may be unjustified to extrapolate from the kinds of studies already cited by making the universal claim that no kind of grammar teaching can improve writing abilities. So far as Gleason's claim is concerned, however, it must be said that it has not been properly tested; at present the necessary resource materials simply do not exist.

At this juncture, it seems fair to suggest that since all the available evidence is so clear, the onus is now on those who still believe that there ought to be a carry-over effect to demonstrate it. In the meantime, those who are satisfied that there are no good reasons for teaching grammar in schools in order to improve writing ability can feel secure in their beliefs.

As for the research into the effectiveness of teaching to that part of traditional grammar concerned with usage, the situation is not quite so clear. Certainly one of the things that students have to learn is that one of the final stages in the writing process is the polishing and refining which removes obtrusive mechanical and conventional problems from the surface of the writing, and various authorities working in the Writing Process model have devised strategies to help them to do so. The evidence that is available, however, suggests thatattempting to achieve this goal by teaching about good usage or mechanics using the terminology of traditional grammar is at least as likely to have quite the opposite effect: some of the studies which have investigated such teaching have shown that it has no demonstrable carry-over effect on student writing except, perversely, to encourage some students to use deprecated forms more frequently than they would have done otherwise (Harris 1962, 1965).

Recent research, however, has pointed to a much more serious adverse effect of teaching directed to mechanical and conventional errors. In a study comparing average and remedial students in first-year college classes, Sharon Pianko (1979) notes that "the remedial group's slower pace for actually putting words on paper can be attributed to their over-concern for mechanics and usage and correct words during composing" (p. 13). This interpretation is supported in a study by Sondra Perl (1980) which showed that what happens in such cases is that the concern for mechanical correctness intrudes so often that it breaks down the rhythms generated by thinking and writing, with the consequence that such writers lose track of their ideas (p. 29). Far from contributing to the improvement of writing, then, teaching about such matters as good usage may actually make the overall quality of writing worse than it would otherwise be.

Beyond this, however, there is evidence that the kind of attention given to mechanical and conventional errors recently, especially in the popular media, is in fact based on a fairly serious misunderstanding of what the actual situation is. For example there has been remarkably little attention given to the demonstration in the Interface Study that the frequency of mechanical and conventional errors at the senior secondary level is acceptably low. In addition, there is a growing body of evidence that where the frequency of mechanical and conventional errors is relatively high, this is not due to the fact that students have not mastered basic skills in this area, but to something quite different. For example, in our own analysis of the frequency of a total of 50 mechanical and conventional errors in the writing of grade seven and eight students writing in two modes, we discovered that students who had produced virtually no mechanical and conventional errors when writing narratives produced far more when they wrote argumentative essays on subjects which were emotionally difficult for them to handle and required them to work at a level of abstraction which was above what they could competently handle (Pringle and Freedman 1979, 1980). Peter Evans reports the same observation in his study of Grade 7 and 8 students across the Province of Ontario (Evans, 1981). And Susan Miller has described a similar phenomenon when first-year university students who had been producing writing of an acceptable quality were required to write an essay dealing with a complex moral problem (Miller, 1980). In all cases it appears to be true that the higher incidence of mechanical and conventional errors is not a problem in itself, but rather a symptom and a consequence of a much more fundamental problem. All these studies confirm Richard Lloyd-Jones' comment that "As one's intellectual reach is extended, one's once adequate writing abilities are no longer sufficient" (Lloyd-Jones 1977:220). This is perhaps especially likely to be the case at the secondary-postsecondary interface, for reasons suggested by Gleason (1977); and certainly we can document that it is the case in one student whose writing career we have traced from Grade 13 through to fourth-year university (Pringle 1980).

This means that the context of concern about the level of writing ability (which is also perhaps part of the context in which this study was first commissioned) is, at least in part, a pseudo-problem. The ability to write may be a basic skill; it is clearly not a skill which is acquired once and for all. Rather, writing ability has to grow to meet the demands made by increasingly difficult tasks, whether the difficulty is emotional, intellectual, or even moral. Understandably, development of the ability to write is not always synchronized to the increased difficulty of the demands, but has to catch up in order to cope with new levels of complexity. This does not necessarily happen automatically, and it hardly ever happens instantaneously. Much of the alleged literacy crisis is in reality due not so much to weaker teaching of basic skills as to increased difficulty in what is demanded of students, both in school and when they finish school.

It is therefore crucial to note that the kinds of problems that a high incidence of mechanical and conventional errors indicate are precisely the problems which the Writing Process approach is best able to help students with: they are typically prewriting problems and thought problems. The evidence for this is particularly clear in our analysis of the kind of problems which appear in the papers of students who are referred to the Writing Tutorial Service at Carleton (for the operation of this Service, see Freedman, 1980). Indeed, it is so clear that it is sometimes surprising that it escapes the notice of the instructors who so assiduously mark the relatively minor mechanical problems and make no comment at all on the major problems.

It seems to us particularly important therefore that, if the intentions of the new guidelines are not to be subverted, prospective teachers and practising teachers need to be made much more fully aware than the student and practising teacher surveys suggest they are of the evidence relating to the validity of traditional grammar either as a system of analysis or as a set of rulings concerning correct usage, and also of the implications of the research in this area for what they do in the classroom. Of course we do not wish to suggest that there may not be other reasons for teaching some kind of grammar other than traditional grammar. Such reasons have been suggested for example by Postman and Weingartner (1966) and H.A. Gleason (1965), just as other authorities have suggested other kinds of language study to take the place of grammar (e.g. Doughty and Thornton 1973). However that is another issue. The issue of grammar in relation to the teaching of writing is central to our present inquiry. Since the student teacher survey and the survey of practising teachers both show very clearly how strong the faith in traditional grammar continues to be, again we will be arguing that the need for relevant professional development is both urgent and massive. In this area too our own work in the schools and with teachers suggests that there has been little significant change since the surveys were made; and that the intention of the guidelines is being subverted by teachers who are responding to them by teaching grammar according to the only model they know: the one they themselves learned in grade school.

This, then, is our view of the theoretical background of the third of the key problem areas that emerge from the surveys.

4.14 Cultural Pressures

The cultural pressures that apply to the subjects discussed in this report are presumably due chiefly to the long-standing tradition of teaching writing and grammar in traditional ways at all levels of the education system. Since they are in this sense "basic" subject areas, everyone has been taught them, and that at too early an age for any critical reaction to have been possible. In large measure, then, the adult population feel that they know what should be taught in this area, and they probably have a fairly clear, if tacit, concept of how it should be taught. And since writing and grammar are also "basic" in a second sense, in that so much of the later stages of education are thought to be dependent on them, people generally also share a very strong conviction that they should be taught. In large measure, as our analysis of the results of the teacher survey shows, teachers themselves share these same assumptions. The unfortunate consequence of that fact has already been suggested in the previous discussion (4.11 and 4.13 above): at a time when there is strong political pressure to stress what are called "basic" skills, and when new Guidelines have been mandated requiring that at least 50% of class time be devoted to language study and writing, a majority of teachers are turning to the only models available to them, the current-traditional approach to writing, and traditional grammar, both probably in a severely attenuated form, both probably dependent on the available text materials which, in too many cases, might be old sets of materials no longer included on Circular 14, such as the third edition of Mastering Effective English.

Teacher education is always a problematic matter. It seems to us that at present training and retraining teachers to teach language and writing in such a way that the intentions of the new guidelines will not be subverted is particularly problematic. Because of the strength of the cultural pressures, we have suggested that the amount of retraining that is required is immense. This view also underlies the recommendations that grow out of this section of the report.

4.15 Structures for Teacher Education

Precisely because of the size of the task of education or re-education that seems to us to be required, the kinds of structure best suited to those purposes were discussed at great length by all the team. Although the structure of teacher education as a whole is clearly beyond the terms of reference of this study, we felt that our interpretation of the results of the surveys required us to comment on several aspects of those structures, and to make recommendations which, while they are intended to address problems that relate specifically to the teaching of writing, would have repercussions for all of teacher education.

4.21 Pre-Service Education

In relation to the pre-service education of prospective

English teachers, three matters of concern grow out of the surveys. The first relates to the relationship between the academic courses which student teachers take and the teaching which they themselves will be doing subsequently. This in turn raises the whole problem of the relationship between university training and professional training for English teachers, and in particular the question as to whether concurrent or consecutive programs are more desirable. Finally, partly in relation to the second issue, the importance of practice teaching, the amount of time devoted to it, and its relation to theoretical instruction are important.

4.211 The English Degree and the Teaching of Writing

Although, on the face of it, it must seem bizarre to say so, it is not clear that a degree in English is the best kind of university training for a future teacher of English or Language Arts at the Intermediate and Senior levels. In the first place, the university English degree has its own tradition - a tradition which is largely independent of what goes on in schools. Increasingly, the focus in post-secondary English has come to be on the study of literature: the old classical ideal of English as a philological discipline taking its place beside Classics and consisting, like Classics, of literary criticism, textual criticism and language study or linguistics, has long since died. Its only echo in most modern English department curricula is the occasional retention of some requirement relating to what is called "language." But as a general rule these language courses are not courses in the structure of the English language, or surveys of grammatical theories, or the theory of composition. Indeed, as the Priestley-Kerpneck Report attests, the shifting focus of university English departments has attenuated even the traditional language component of the English degree: the courses in Old and Middle English, Old Norse, and the history of the English language. Often these courses are required, if at all, only of honours students. As a result, only that minority of students whose highest qualification is at least an honours B.A. and who have majored in English alone (rather than English combined with another subject) are likely to have taken such courses and then only if they graduated before 1970, or graduated from a conservative department. Otherwise they may have had no formal introduction at all to the study of language.

But, as we have already seen, these traditional language courses are not regarded by practising teachers as having been particularly useful to them as a preparation for teaching writing in the schools, and still less for the teaching of exposition. For most students in English departments, therefore, even if they know as they set out on their degree that they want to become English teachers, there has been no opportunity at all to take the kinds of course in language that the instructors in the Faculties of Education would like to build on.

Similarly rhetoric, if it is taught at all, is taken to be introductory composition and rhetoric, which is probably felt to be distasteful because essentially remedial (compare the Priestley-Kerpneck Report, pp. 19-22), or else is taken to mean classical rhetorical theory as applied to a critical analysis of literature. Rhetoric in its original sense of the study of discourse in general is simply not taught. In fact, there are very few composition courses, let alone courses about theories of discourse. The writing that is assigned - and, sometimes, discussed in marginal comments - is necessarily only writing about literature, a very specialized and idiosyncratic genre, hardly typical of the broad range of writing tasks that elementary and secondary students ought to be engaged in.

What a university English degree offers, then, is above all the study of literature, and the cultivation of the sensibility that comes from the study of great literature. These are excellent things in themselves, and we do not want to call into question the claim that the commitment to the discipline of English literary studies, or to humane literacy, which is the consequence of an English degree at its best, is desirable in English teachers.

But it is not enough. As we have seen throughout the three previous chapters, students graduate with a degree in English thinking that the study of English is the study of literature; that writing, in relation to English, means writing expository essays about literature; and that their work as English teachers will be to teach what they were taught at university - to miniature versions of themselves. Sometimes the consequence is the study of the symbolism of Othello in grade 10 and 40-page literary research essays in grade 12 and 13. Moreover it has a further effect which is especially unfortunate at the present time: it trains its graduates to focus on the quality of the finished piece of writing, the literary text. It thus reinforces precisely those aspects of the current-traditional approach to the teaching of writing that are most inimical to the Writing Process approach. As W.R. Winterowd (Professor of English, Linguistics and Rhetoric at the University of Southern California) has commented (1980: 159-60):

> It is paradoxical that the academy - universities which train teachers of reading and writing - typically bestow authority in the wrong field. By and large, the secondary and college teachers of reading and writing have gained authority in the study of literature, in interpretation, history of ideas, biography, and so on . . . . The authority that teachers have is a paradox precisely because teachers of reading and writing are not so much concerned with the text as with the processes whereby a text is constructed by a writer and subsequently reconstructed by a reader. It might be said that knowledge of literature is mainly knowledge of texts and that knowledge of literacy is mainly knowledge of processes.

The fact that their education thus reinforces the current traditional approach to the teaching of writing makes the apparent territorial claim which we noted in our discussion of the Secondary English domain among the student teachers somewhat ominous. They may lack authority in the area of writing, but they do not know that themselves.

Since what the Faculties of Education have to do within their present structure is already more than is possible, we believe that the only possible solution to this problem is for the Faculties of Education to require courses on writing and language as part of the entrance requirements for prospective teachers.

Recommendation

We therefore recommend that all students entering Faculties of Education as Language Arts or English specialists have the following prerequisites:

1. a course in writing and theories of rhetoric
2. a course in language designed for teachers or generalists.

It is our view that the Faculties of Education should simply make such requirements entrance requirements, and leave the universities to respond to them. However we are uncomfortably aware that the number of English departments in the Province which are in a position to respond to such a demand is extremely small. Precisely because of the narrowing of the range of English studies to an almost exclusively literary orientation, most English Departments do not have faculty members trained in these areas. And it needs to be said, and indeed stressed, that the kinds of knowledge required to teach such courses are not the kinds imparted by a degree in English at any level. As one of our colleagues commented, for many professors of English it would be easier to retrain in Art History than in the theory of writing. That field, as we have sketched it in the previous section, has become something far removed from the present-day concerns of English departments. It requires a considerable knowledge of linguistics, and especially the literature on language acquisition and development; familiarity with key areas of developmental and cognitive psychology; an ability to deal with the experimental procedures used in the Social Sciences and to understand statistics; a thorough knowledge of classical rhetoric and more especially an up-to-date acquaintance with the rapidly growing body of literature in what is called the "new" rhetoric; familiarity with the basic works of linguistic philosophy and with the rapidly expanding field of discourse analysis; some knowledge of semiotics and the symbolist school of linguistic philosophy founded by Susanne K. Langer; and at the same time a sensible appreciation of what goes on in schools and what it is that teachers actually do. The scope of what is involved really requires retraining at the doctoral level; it is not something that an English professor can reasonably be asked to work up over a summer in the same way as she might be asked to turn from the study of Milton and work up a course on Canadian literature.

Equally, however, it is not clear that departments of Linguistics are the best site for such courses. Apart from the fact that not all Ontario universities have programs in Linguistics, with one exception university Linguistics departments to date have not turned to the study of that special area of language acquisition which is the development of writing ability. And even the kind of course in language which we have in mind is not usually available in Linguistics departments. For, like English departments, Linguistics departments wear the blinkers of their special interests. In the case of university Linguistics departments, the special interest is naturally theoretical linguistics. Introductory courses in Linguistics are typically courses which are intended to introduce students to Linguistics as a discipline, and to provide them with basic information and basic analytical techniques which later courses can build on. For similar reasons, the courses that are sometimes offered on structures of English tend to be courses which use the English language as data to illustrate aspects of grammatical theory or techniques of grammatical analysis. Hence our recommendation of a course in language designed for teachers or generalists: we want to make it quite clear that the needs which this recommendation is intended to address are not likely to be met by putting together a group of already extant courses in English or Linguistics departments. In most institutions, totally new courses are required. And it is possible that the best qualified people to offer such courses will in fact be found in Faculties of Education rather than in the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Social Sciences.

4.212 Concurrent and Consecutive Programs

The relative merits of concurrent and consecutive programs for professional training were raised on a number of occasions in the course of the surveys, and were much discussed by the team at various times. Realistically, so far as Ontario is concerned, consecutive programs are clearly the norm and are likely to remain so. For a number of reasons, however, most members of the team consider that concurrent programs are desirable and perhaps preferable, and if it were not so clearly beyond the scope of the terms of reference of this study, a formal recommendation might well have been included to the effect that those Faculties which already have concurrent programs be encouraged to expand them, and that those which do not should institute them.

One of the possible merits of a concurrent program relates to the topic of the previous sub-section: for those prospective teachers who, from the time they first enter university, know that they want to become teachers of English or Language Arts, the concurrent program makes it possible to give them advice which will point them to potentially relevant courses that may not be offered in their major department and may therefore escape their attention entirely. For this reason, we would extend the previous recommendation so that it applies also to students enrolled in concurrent programs.

Recommendation

We recommend that students enrolled in concurrent programs as elementary or Engish specialists take the following courses:

1. A course in writing and theories of rhetoric;
2. A course in language designed for teachers or generalists.

4.213 Practice Teaching

As we have seen, the student teachers were positive about their practice teaching in comparison to the whole of their training. The practising teachers were less enthusiastic, but nonetheless rated it higher than any of the other nine aspects of teacher education singled out for evaluation. On the other hand, both surveys suggested that practice teaching had not been particularly useful to them as a means of learning something about the teaching of writing and more particularly of exposition. This judgment corresponds to the problem raised by the Faculty members we interviewed: the problem that they have no control over what their students see and do in the course of their practice teaching.

If expository writing is taken as an example of one part of the English and Language Arts curricula, and a part which it might be desirable for student teachers to observe and to teach during the course of their practice teaching, then the analysis of the results of the Student Teacher Survey show how right the Faculties are in their concern that what the students see and do during the course of their practice teaching may not correlate with what the Faculties would like them to see and do, if they were in a position to exercise more control.

Yet it is inevitable that this should be so. Viewing the results cynically, one is tempted to assert that the mismatch between the student teachers' needs and the host schools' may not be entirely bad. If, owing to the constraints imposed by the host school's system and by the community, student teachers do not get a chance to observe teaching that is likely to be a useful model for them, do not get a chance to teach at the level they would prefer, are not able to teach the subject areas of most interest to them, and are not permitted to try out teaching techniques based on their own innovative ideas or innovative ideas taught in the Faculties, then their introduction to the realities of teaching may be accurate. Perhaps the small percentage of the student teacher population that was able to teach the preferred level, phase and subject is abnormal.

At all events, it is not easy to see how the situation might be changed. After all, the first responsibility of the schools in which the student teachers do their practice teaching is not to the student teachers but to the pupils and to the community which the schools serve. They have curricula to follow which cannot be disrupted beyond a very small degree in order to accommodate the needs of student teachers: neither the administrations of the schools nor for that matter the parents could be expected to tolerate extensive interruptions of the work of the school for such a reason. If, however, expository writing is taken as an example of one aspect of English and Language Arts, an aspect which it would be desirable for future English teachers to see taught and to teach themselves during their practice teaching, then it can serve to illustrate and clarify the problem of the mismatch between student teachers' needs and the host schools' needs.

Future teachers of English or Language Arts should ideally have some exposure to a range of the most important subjects they will be teaching later. In our questionnaire, we distinguished these as exposition, other kinds of writing, language study, and literature. Considering these as four distinct content areas which almost everyone teaching English and Language Arts at the 7-13 levels will have to handle in the course of the year, student teachers should probably have some exposure to all four of them. If their exposure to them is not to be so brief as to be absolutely meaningless, however, then (given the relatively short amount of time now devoted to practice teaching) they would probably need to devote about a quarter of the available time to each of them. But realistically they are not likely to be given equal amounts of time in an English or Language Arts curriculum at any level. Nor should they. And in any case, they are even less likely to be offered in frequent rotation, daily or weekly throughout the year. Hence whether or not student teachers can be exposed to all of them or any of them can only depend on sheer chance. In the nature of things, the possibility of being exposed to all of them is very slim, as the results of the Student Teacher Questionnaire show.

Clearly the feeling of dissatisfaction evident in our discussions with the Faculties of Education and in the results of the Survey of Practising Teachers are justified. The results of all three surveys point to a much longer period of practice teaching.

Recommendation:

> We therefore recommend that the amount of time devoted to practice teaching be increased substantially.

How such a recommendation is to be effected is something which we feel is best left to the Faculties to decide. However without making any specific recommendations, we would like to note a number of possibilities.

Firstly, for reasons related in part to the subject of the following section as well as to this one, we believe an internship system consisting of one summer of teacher education concentrating on practical techniques, a year's closely supervised internship, and a subsequent summer devoted to more theoretical instruction, would be a more desirable pattern than the one most widely in effect at present. Secondly, the kind of concurrent system offered at York obviously allows for much more practice teaching, and it is worth noting that a breakdown of the results of the Student Teacher Survey by institution showed that the students at York were indeed more appreciative of their practice teaching than the students of the remaining institutions. Moreover, as has already been noted, concurrent programmes allow for much more carefully selected, and possibly more relevant academic programmes. Thirdly, again in part for reasons to be taken up in the following section, we think that there might be a case for extending the period of consecutive teacher training to two years. This would allow for much more intensive and perhaps more structured practice teaching. Still more elaborately, teacher training might consist of a year in the Faculty considering teaching techniques, observing and doing some practice teaching, then a year of supervised internship, and then a third year in the Faculty, considering relevant theory and relevant background materials in the light of the year's experience, and testing them through more observation and more practice teaching.

All these possibilities have a number of things in common. They suggest structures which would allow for much more practice teaching than is the case at present. They also suggest structures which, with one exception, would require much more time in teacher training than is the case at present. It seems to us defensible to suggest that a single year of professional training, after a degree whose content may not be very directly relevant to the work of a teacher, is probably not enough. Certainly all other professionals have to have a great deal more. And in this area as in so many others, the market at the present time will bear it.

Thirdly, they all address a specific problem which did not arise directly from the analysis of any of the surveys, but proved to be a major concern in the Teacher Education Commission of the

Third International Conference on the Teaching of English held in Sydney, Australia, in August, 1980. In that Commission, the transition from the year or years of teacher education to the status of a practising teacher was seen as a traumatic experience for a majority of teachers. Coming from the Faculties with innovative techniques (often untried), recent theories (often imperfectly understood), vulnerable in their idealism and in their lack of experience, they too often find themselves, according to the view expressed in the Commission, in a staffroom where the most forceful voices are usually from the most cynical teachers, in a school situation where the curriculum may be highly structured, and structured in ways which require a kind of teaching, and a content of teaching, fundamentally antithetical to everything they have learned. Traditionally, whether or not they are awarded a teaching certificate has depended on their performance during that first teaching year, and often the people appointed as judges of their performance are those who set the curriculum which they are supposed to teach. In New Zealand, according to one communication in the Commission, some of these problems are reduced by means of, firstly, a reduction in the teaching load of a first year teacher (first year teachers are simply not allowed to teach more than 80% of the normal load), and secondly, by means of a kind of extension of the host teacher system by which each first-year teacher is assigned to a senior teacher who has special responsibilities in assisting the first-year teacher during the first year. More generally, a subcommission on Teacher Education and the Initiation of the Beginning Teachers made a number of recommendations (Brock et al, 1980), some of which included the following:

> There should be a real support system for the beginning teacher involving the teacher training institution, the employing authority and the school staff.
>
> The Principal and the English staff should have an "induction program" which welcomes new teachers and informs them of or gives them access to the kind of information they need.
>
> Beginning teachers must be allowed the freedom to fail, knowing that there is a support system to depend on if this happens.
>
> The need for assistance, advice and help should be perceived not as an admission of failure or inadequacy but as a normal process, by teachers, employing authorities, and fellow teachers. Too often, beginning teachers refuse such support because of their fear that such a request will be interpreted punitively by their superiors.

Such policies will not in themselves ensure that the knowledge and idealism which student teachers bring with them at the end of their year of teacher training are going to survive. But they may help them to survive. And in the process, they will assure a much closer integration of the Faculties and the schools. Such an integration seems to us likely to be especially useful in the case of teaching writing and language in particular, because practising teachers are clearly just as much in need of contact with recent theorizing and research in these areas as student teachers are with classroom experience.

4.214 Practice and Theory

Yet another traditional problem in teacher education which surfaced in relation to the training of teachers to teach writing is the amount of theory to be included in teacher education, and how it is to be ordered with respect to more practical instruction. So far as writing is concerned, this question is particularly problematic because so much of what student teachers need to know about language and writing has still to be learned, and much of it is certainly theoretical.

Typically, the comments of both student teachers and practising teachers on the theoretical component in their Faculty of Education or teacher training programs were highly unfavourable, and this phenomenon is world-wide. Yet some of it must certainly be unjust. A recent English graduate with virtually no classroom teaching experience is in no position personally, academically or professionally to evaluate theoretical discussions, nor to assimilate theories in ways mediated by teaching experience to make them part of his or her professional equipment. Instead, they too often uncritically reject theory as airy vacuities.

Such judgments are quite clear from the student survey. They show up as well in the practising teachers' ranking of the various aspects of their teacher training (Table 3.8, Section 3.4), and more particularly in the teacher's evaluations of the usefulness of specific courses to their work in teaching writing and their explicit comments on the theoretical component of their own training. The converse of these judgments, however, is that when teachers who already have considerable teaching experience come to take the same courses, as is sometimes the case in jurisdictions which allow teachers to begin to teach before they receive any professional training, or when experienced teachers return to the Faculties to take what may be similar courses, perhaps even taught by the same people, they find them much more useful. Part of the problem, then, is the student teachers' unreadiness.

Given the kind of structure currently in force in the majority of Ontario Faculties of Education, we feel that comments of this kind point to a need for some rearrangement of the organisation of teaching in the Faculties in such a way that the earlier part of teacher training will concentrate more on practical techniques, with theory taught only when student teachers have had more classroom experience that will enable them to contextualize and thus benefit from the theoretical courses.

Recommendation

> We therefore recommend that where possible teacher training be organized in such a way that students will first be taught practical classroom procedures, and will then have occasions to practice teaching, with instruction in theory either following practice teaching or concurrent with it.

It should be noted that although this recommendation addresses the structures currently in force, it should apply as well to any revisions along the lines envisaged in the previous subsection.

4.3 In-service Training

At the present time there is an urgent need for in-service courses for teachers in language and writing. The justification for the recommendation which follows comes firstly from the explicit comments in the Survey of Practising Teachers. Again and again they recommend in-service courses in writing language and grammar. Our analysis of the attitudinal parts of the questionnaire in the light of the theory and research summarized at the beginning of this chapter shows that they need such courses far more even than they themselves recognize.

Recommendation

> We therefore recommend that programs be established to provide in-service training for teachers in the areas of language and especially writing.

The previous discussion has already suggested something of what the structure of such courses should be. The amount of retraining that is required is such that one-day workshops, or even one-week workshops, are not enough. The Writing Process approach to the teaching of writing particularly requires that teachers understand the theory behind the approach. In any area of education, the separation of teaching strategies from the theorizing in which they are founded and the research which tests their effectiveness is potentially dangerous: detached from their theoretical contexts, teaching strategies can degenerate into a series of gimmicks which may have that welcome and blessed quality that they give teachers something to do on Monday morning, but do so only by keeping students occupied in activities which are totally pointless. And this danger is all the more acute in the case of the Writing Process approach to the teaching of writing, because there are so few derived teaching strategies which can be laid out in neat little summaries and applied without too much concern for their theoretical context. Rather, as we have already noted, the Writing Process approach depends on a very fundamental reorientation on the part of teachers.

As a minimum, then, what is needed is in the first place an academic course or academic courses, taught by people who are sensitive enough to the needs of practising teachers to be able to help them to draw on their teaching experience and see how the new approach can be put into effect - but not necessarily taught by Faculty of Education instructors.

Several models are available for such in-service training. One is the Bay Area Writing Project, which is represented in Volume II, Chapter 4, by two articles from the early promotional material circulated by the project. Since the time of their publication, the Bay Area Writing Project has expanded to become the heart of what is now called the National Writing Project: following California, a majority of American States have set up

Writing Projects on the model of the Bay Area Writing Project.

In structure, this has continued to be what it is described to be in Volume II. It depends on the intensive but highly practically oriented training during the summer of a cadre of leaders drawn from interested teachers. The practical experience of these people is regarded as crucial, and one of the features of the in-service sessions is that the participants are asked to do an enormous amount of writing. This cadre of "experts" then goes back to the schools, with provision made for some release time during which they give mini-workshops, often only of an hour or two, giving other teachers some insight into the techniques they learned during their summer courses. At the same time, they keep a watch out for other teachers who have developed strategies for teaching writing which are considered to be particularly effective, and such teachers are sometimes invited to give short workshops under the aegis of the Writing Project even though they have not themselves taken the summer course. Sometimes a group forms, comprising perhaps one of the teachers who have taken the summer course, a member of the staff of the summer program, and other teachers who have been drawn in, and such groups are in a position to mount a one-day or one-week workshop at very short notice and to pass on many tested strategies for teaching writing. A somewhat similar group, inspired partly by the Bay Area Writing Project, operates out of the Faculty of Education of the University of British Columbia, and is called the U.B.C. Writing Project.

Such an approach might well be combined with an approach to in-service training that is apparently in force in some jurisdictions in Australia. Instead of having the equivalent of Ontario's professional development days (and it may be remembered that the practising teachers were very negative about the usefulness of professional development day workshops), these jurisdictions maintain a full-time staff which can take over _a whole school_ for a week, so that the whole staff of the school is released for a week of intensive study and reflection. In a week, one cannot teach teachers everything they need to know about language and writing. But one can give them enough practice in the process of writing, and direct their own reflection on that experience sufficiently, to begin the task of reorientation that is required as a first step. It has been our experience in workshops we have conducted together and jointly with Donald Murray of the University of New Hampshire Writing Process Laboratory that anything less than a week is inadequate even for this purpose. We suspect that the kind of structure used in Australia to make this possible would not be any more expensive than the current system of P.D. days. In addition, it would have the effect of providing employment for teachers in a useful way at a time of shrinking enrolments, and would probably be highly satisfactory to working parents who now have to make special arrangements when their children's schooling is interrupted by P.D. day workshops.

Although this kind of structure thus has several attractive characteristics, in our view it is the weakest of the available models. It depends heavily on the enthusiasm of individual teachers, and does not put enough stress on understanding why particular techniques work or even whether they work. In some of the B.A.W.P. workshops we ourselves have participated in, teaching strategies were recommended by teachers which were in fact inimical to the overall goals of the Bay Area Writing Project as they are described in their literature and as they were elaborated for us by the Director and research staff of the Project when we visited it. The enthusiasm of practising teachers, and the wealth of accumulated experience they can draw on, may be too often neglected in theoretically oriented approaches to any aspect of teacher education (a point stressed in Britton 1980 and Rosen 1980). But enthusiasm alone is not enough; it needs to be informed by some knowledge of relevant theory and research.

A second model is the system of Teachers Centres that is in effect in some British jurisdictions. In the best of these, teachers of sometimes extraordinary talents are paid fulltime to be available to teachers who need them; Harold Rosen, for example, has worked as a resource person in such a centre in London. In this system, teachers who want to find out more about writing, for example, go to the centre at a time which is suitable for them, and discuss their needs with the resource person. He or she then begins to work with the teacher on a one-to-one basis, pointing the teacher towards relevant literature, discussing it with the teacher and helping the teacher to review his or her teaching experience in the light of what has been read, and may even visit the classroom and teach in it.

At its best, this is a magnificent system, and one of the reasons why it works so well at its best is that it starts from the individual teacher's perception of a need. Unfortunately it also depends on the availability of a Harold Rosen; in addition, it can reach only a few teachers at a time.

Somewhat related to these but also closer to familiar academic structures are the various programs which help teachers to come to terms with the practical implications of the Writing Process approach by means of research projects. Such an approach has been crucial to the success of the Language Across the Curriculum movement in Britain (Martin et al 1976). Sometimes such programs come to be formal academic programs; this is the case, for example, with the "Certificate" programs at Exeter, under the direction of Andrew Wilkinson, and at Lancaster, under the direction of Chris Candlin, the former attached to a School of Education, the latter to a Department of Linguistics. In both cases the Certificate program results in a Certificate which is guaranteed by the University, and is described in terms which show it to be a post-graduate diploma comprised of essentially undergraduate courses, having a status lower than a Master's degree, but still recognized essentially as a post-graduate qualification in the sense that those who take it normally have a first degree.

Such programs address squarely the problem of knowledge which is a key problem in this area. So too does the program developed by W.R. Winterowd as the "Huntington Beach Project," which is described in Winterowd 1980. The "Certificate in English Language and Composition" at Carleton is modelled in part on such programs. Finally, there is the possibility of M.A.T. Programs specifically in the area of writing, and also M.A. programs in rhetoric (at present there is no program in Canada that addresses itself to the kinds of needs we perceive, but there are several in the United States), and also of course a few American Ph.D. programs which focus particularly on writing and rhetorical theory (notably that under the direction of Richard Young at Carnegie-Mellon University).

If practising teachers are to derive any benefit from the small number of such programs that are available, then it seems to us essential that the Ministry recognize them for what they are even if they are not offered by a Faculty of Education. The need for some action in this area can be clarified by reference to the two Certificate programs in the Teaching of English as a Second Language which are offered in Ontario universities outside of Faculties of Education. Both programs consist of university courses which can also be taken towards a university degree. One of them contains five full university credits; the other six. They are both older than the majority of programs now offered by Faculties of Education as the three-part Ministry Course in TESL, which teachers usually take over three summers. Both of them are taught by people of impeccable academic qualifications, and one of them at least has a considerable international reputation thanks to the quality of the scholarly research and the materials development undertaken by the staff. Both have had considerable success in placing their graduates in ESL teaching situations throughout the world. And the Teacher Education Branch of the Ministry of Education has repeatedly refused to recognize their validity as a teaching qualification for teachers of English as a Second language on the grounds that they are not offered in a Faculty of Education.

But one thing that is very clear in the Survey of Practising Teachers is that practising teachers do not think very highly of Ministry courses which they have taken since beginning their careers. And studies in other jurisdictions (compare, for example, Brock 1980 for Australia) have shown, as we have already noted, that experienced teachers often appreciate the theoretical component of teacher education courses in a way that is not possible for recent graduates. Moreover it seems clear to us (and again we would cite Britton 1980 and Rosen 1980 in support) that practising teachers do not need to be provided with practice teaching opportunities in in-service courses, and least of all the kind of practice teaching that is usually offered in summer courses which, since schools are out, can be extremely artificial. On the contrary, teachers who have taught for five or ten years have already had all the teaching experience they need. What they need is theory and guidance in reviewing their teaching experience in the light of that theory. Lest the Ministry make the same mistake with respect to extant programs offering in-service training for teachers in the area of language and writing, therefore,

Recommendation

> We recommend that where academically sound programs for practising teachers are available in university faculties other than Faculties of Education, these programs be recognized by the Ministry as offering both professional and academic training equivalent to that offered by Faculties of Education in specialized certificate programs.

The final recommendation of this volume grows out of an uneasy suspicion that where the needs are as great as we perceive them to be, it may not be enough to rely on the interest of individual teachers. After many discussions of possible ways of ensuring in-service education in the area of language and writing, the team decided to recommend the kind of review of certification which is in effect in many parts of the world.

Recommendation

> We recommend that continued certification be dependent on proof of in-service training in areas directly relevant to teachers' work in the classroom, the relevance to be defined in consultation with the Teachers' Federations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Barnes, D. (1973). Language in the Classroom. London: Open University Press.

Barnes, D. (1976). From Communication to Curriculum. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Barnes, D., Britton, J.N., and Rosen, H. (1969). Language, the Learner and the School. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bereiter, C., and Scardamalia, M. (Forthcoming, a). "Does Learning to Write Have to be so Difficult?". Forthcoming in A. Freedman, I. Pringle and J. Yalden (eds.) Learning to Write: First Language; Second Language. London: Longman.

Bereiter, C., and Scardamalia, M. (Forthcoming, b). "From Conversation to Composition: The Role of Instruction in a Developmental Process." Forthcoming in R. Glaser (ed.) Advances in Instructional Psychology, Vol. 2, Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Britton, J.N. (1972). "What's the Use? A Schematic Account of Language Functions." In A. Cashdan and E. Grugeon (eds.) Language in Education (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul in Association with the Open University Press), 245-251.

Briton, J.N. (1978). "The Composing Processes and the Functions of Writing." In Cooper and Odell (1978), 13-28.

Britton, J.N. (1980). "A Retrospective and Prospective View of the Teaching of English." Occasional Address to the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia, August 17, 1980.

Britton, J.N., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., and Rosen, H. (1975). The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18). London: MacMillan.

Brock, P. (1980). "Towards a Restructuring of University Teacher Education Programmes." Unpublished Paper.

Brock, P., Alcorn, N., Bull, G., Campbell, H., Chapman, W., Fitzgibbon, T., Gibbs, S., Hogan, H.M., Jenning, C., Jones, W., Pringle, I., and Smith, R. "Teacher Education and the Initiation of the Beginning Teacher." Subgroup Report prepared for the Commission on Teacher Education, Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia, August 17-22, 1980.

Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

Christensen, F.A. (1967). Notes Towards a New Rhetoric. New York: Harper and Row.

Christensen, F.A., and Munson, M.M. (1968). The Christensen Rhetoric Program. New York: Harper and Row.

Close, R.A. (1975). A Reference Grammar for Students of English. London: Longman.

Cooper, C.R., and Odell, L. (1978) (eds.). Research on Composing. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Cresswell, T.J. (1975). Usage in Dictionaries and Dictionaries of Usage. (PADS, nos. 63-64). University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Daiker, D., Kerek, A., and Morenberg, M. (1979 a) (eds.). Sentence Combining. Akron, Ohio: L&S Books.

Daiker, D., Kerek, A., and Morenberg, M. (1979 b) The Writer's Options. Oxford, Ohio: Miami University.

Doughty, P., and Thornton, J. (1973). Language Study, the Teacher and Learner. London: Edward Arnold.

Emig, J. (1971). The Composing Process of Twelfth-Graders. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Emig, J. (1980). "The Tacit Tradition." In A. Freedman and I. Pringle (eds.) Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. (Conway, Ark.: L&S Books for CCTE): 9-17.

Evans, P.J.A. (In Press). "Observations on the Conduct of Large-Scale Evaluation of Writing." In I. Pringle and A. Freedman (eds.) Teaching Writing Learning. Toronto: CCTE.

Fillion, B. (1979). "Language Across the Curriculum: Examining the Place of Language in our Schools." McGill Journal of Education, 14: 47-60.

Flower, L., and Hayes, J.R. (1980 a). "The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem." College Composition and Communication, 31: 21-32.

Flower, L., and Hayes, J.R. (1980 b). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. Paper presented at the Conference of College Composition and Communication, Washington, D.C., March, 1980.

Francis, W. Nelson (1964). "Revolution in Grammar." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 40: 299-312.

Freedman, A. (1980). "During Not After: An Untraditional Approach to the Teaching of Writing." English in Education, 14:2-9.

Freedman, A., and Pringle, I. (1980) (eds.). Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Conway, Ark.: L&S Books for CCTE.

Gleason, H.A. (1965). Linguistics and English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gleason, H.A. (1977). "Learn to Write by Writing." Indirections, 3, 1: 17-27.

Harris, R.J. (1963). An Experimental Inquiry into the Functions and Value of Formal Grammar in the Teaching of English.... Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London.

Harris, R.J. (1965). "The Only Disturbing Feature...." Use of English, 16: 197-202.

Hayes, J.R., and Flower, L. (1979). Writing as Problem Solving. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Hayes, J.R., and Flower, L. (In press). "Identifying the Organization of Writing Processes." In L.W. Gregg and E.R. Steinberg (eds.) Cognitive Processes in Writing. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. (1975). A Communicative Grammar of English. London: Longman.

Lloyd-Jones, R. (1977). "The Politics of Composition." College Composition and Communication, 28: 218-222.

Macauley, W.J. (1948). "The Difficulty of Grammar." British Journal of Educational Psychology, 17: 153-162.

Marland, M. (1977) (ed.). Language Across the Curriculum. London: Heinemann.

Martin, N., D'Arcy, P., Newton, B., and Parker, R. (1976). Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum (11-16). London: Ward Lock.

McQuade, D. (1979) (ed.). Linguistics, Stylistics and the Teaching of Composition. Akron, Ohio: L&S Books.

McTeague, F., and others. (In press). "An Investigation of Secondary Writing Across the Curriculum." In I. Pringle and A. Freedman (eds.), Teaching Writing Learning. Toronto: CCTE.

Mellon, J.C. (1967). Transformational Sentence Combining. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Mellon, J.C. (1979). "Issues in the Theory and Practice of Sentence Combining: A Twenty Year Perspective." In Daiker, Kerek and Morenberg (1979 a): 1-38.

Memering, W.D., and O'Hare, F. (1980). The Writer's Work. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, S. (1980). "Rhetorical Maturity: Definition and Development." In Freedman and Pringle (1980): 119-127.

Murray, D.M. (1978). "Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery." In Cooper and Odell (1978): 85-103.

Murray, D.M. (1980). "The Feel of Writing - And Teaching Writing." In Freedman and Pringle (1980): 67-73.

Obenchain, A. (1971). Effectiveness of the Precise Essay Question in Programming the Sequential Development of Written Composition Skills and the Simultaneous Development of Critical Reading Skills. Unpublished M.A. thesis, George Washington University.

Obenchain, A. (1976). Links to forceful writing. Part one: Sentence Power. Reston, Va.: Validated Writing Systems.

Obenchain, A. (1977). Links to forceful writing. Part two: Paragraph and multi-paragraph power. Reston, Va.: Validated Writing Systems.

O'Hare, F. (1973). Sentence-Combining. Improving Student Writing Without Formal Grammar Instruction. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

O'Hare, F. (1975). Sentencecraft. Lexington, Mass.: Ginn and Co.

Park, D. (1980). "Theories and Expectations: On Conceiving Composition as a Discipline." College English, 41: 47 ff.

Perl, S. (1979). "The Composing Process of Unskilled College Writers." Research in the Teaching of English, 13: 317-336.

Perl, S., and Egendorf, A. "The Process of Creative Discovery: Theory, Research, and Implications for Teaching." In McQuade (1979).

Pianko, S. (1977). The Composing Acts of College Freshman Writers: A Description. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

Pianko, S. (1979). "A Description of the Composing Processes of College Freshman Writers." Research in the Teaching of English, 13: 5-22.

Pitkin, W.L. (1977 a). Hierarchies and the Discourse Hierarchy. College English 38:648-659.

Pitkin, W.L. (1977 b). X/Y: Some Basic Strategies of Discourse. College English 38:648-659.

Pitkin, W.L. (n.d.). X/Y: Writing Two Steps at a Time. Logan: Utah State University Department of English.

Postman, N., and Weingartner, C. (1966). Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching. New York: Delta.

Priestley, F.E.L., and Kerpneck, H.I. (1976). Report of Commission on Undergraduate Studies in English in Canadian Universities. A.C.U.T.E.

Pringle, I. (1976). "The Case for Restoring Grammar." The English Quarterly, 9, 3: 19-30.

Pringle, I. (1980). The Development of Writing Ability at the Post-Secondary Level: A Case Study. Paper delivered at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington, D.C.

Pringle, I., and Freedman, A. (1979). The Carleton Writing Project, Part I. The Writing Abilities of a Selected Sample of Grade 7 and 8 Students. Report prepared for the Carleton Board of Education, 133 Greenbank Road, Nepean, Ontario.

Pringle, I., and Freedman, A. (1980). The Carleton Writing Project, Part II. The Writing Abilities of a Representative Sample of Grade 5, 8 and 12 Students. Report prepared for the Carleton Board of Education, 133 Greenbank Road, Nepean, Ontario.

Pringle, I., and Freedman, A. (1981) (eds.). Teaching Writing Learning. Toronto: CCTE.

Quirk, R., and Greenbaum, S. (1973). A University Grammar of English. London: Longman.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvick, J. (1972). A Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Longman.

Rosen, H. (1980). English, Multicultural Education and Minority Groups. Paper delivered at the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, Sydney, Australia, August 17, 1980.

Rosen, C., and Rosen, H. (1973). The Language of Primary School Children. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., and Fillion, B. (1979). The Little Red Writing Book: A Sourcebook of Consequential Writing Activities. Toronto: OISE Pedagogy of Writing Project.

Stockwell, R., Schachter, P., and Partee, B.H. (1973). The Major Syntactic Structures of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strong, W. (1973). *Sentence Combining: A Composing Book*. New York: Random House.

Strong, W. (1980). *Sentence Combining, Paragraph Linking*. New York: Random House.

Walker, G., and Fitchett, J. (1979). A Survey of the Amount and Kind of Writing by Grade 7 and 8 Students. Ottawa Board of Education, Research Centre.

Winterowd, W.R. (1980). "Developing a Composition Program." In Freedman and Pringle (1980): 157-185.

Wolfram, W., and Fasold, R. (1974). *The Study of Social Dialects in American English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Young, R.E. (1978). "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." In Cooper and Odell (1978): 29-48.

APPENDIX I

PROCEDURES FOR SURVEY OF PRACTISING ENGLISH TEACHERS IN ONTARIO SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 1977

by

D.K. Dale
Department of Mathematics & Statistics,
Carleton University

This study was designed to provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the training Ontario Secondary School teachers of English received in universities and Colleges of Education. Of particular interest was the level of preparation for teaching transactional writing or exposition. Because of the detailed information required, and the budget constraints it was decided to select a sample of practising English teachers in Grades 9 to 13 in the Ontario Secondary Schools.

1. The Sample Design

To improve the precision of the estimates and to effect administrative controls, the population of English teachers was divided into strata. These strata were defined as those Secondary School English Teachers within the School Boards of the following Regions; in effect the type of Region defined the strata.

Region	Definition
1	The metropolitan area of Toronto
2	The metropolitan area of Hamilton (which has a unique system with respect to grade 13)
3	The rural and small areas of Western Ontario
4	The larger urban areas of Central Ontario
5	The larger urban areas of Eastern Ontario
6	The rural and small urban areas of Central Ontario
7	The rural and small urban areas of Eastern Ontario

Within the metropolitan and urban areas (Regions 1, 4 and 5) a further stage of stratification was adopted. Secondary schools in these areas whose highest grade was Grade 12, were sampled separately. Thus in Regions 1, 4 and 5, secondary schools were allotted to two sub-strata.

- those that had a Grade 13
- those whose highest level was Grade 12

Within each region the Boards of Education were listed with the corresponding number of schools, number of English teachers, and total staff. These data, though not current values, were accepted as providing a reasonable measure of the relative sizes of the Boards and the schools. Recognizing the factors that would affect the sample take, including:

a) out-of-date measures of size

b) refusal of School Boards to co-operate

c) refusal of teachers to respond

d) cost factors, etc.

it was decided to aim for an expected take at design of over 100 teachers per region, allowing increases in this expectation where there was an expected higher variance in the Region (e.g. Toronto) or there was a small number of Boards in a Region. In the latter case non-cooperation of a Board could seriously affect the number of enumerated teachers. (e.g. Regions 4 and 5). The expected sample takes at the design level are given in Table A.1.

Table A.1

EXPECTED SAMPLE TAKE AT THE DESIGN LEVEL; BY REGION

Region	Highest School Grade	Sampling Ratio	Expected-Take Number of Teachers
1	13	2/8	259
2	13	Take All	13
3	--	2/8	117
4	13	2/7	136
5	13	2/10	168
6	--	2/12	122
7	--	2/10	138
1	12	2/5	122
2	12	Take All	138
4+5	12	Take All	145

It was recognized that estimates of variance would be complex, and costly to obtain, thus replicated sampling was used. Under this method two independent samples were selected in the sampled Regions, (this excludes those Regions where the sampling ratio is "Take-All") using for each sample half the ratio specified above. These independent samples provide two estimates p_1 and p_2 of the proportion of English Teachers with a specified characteristic. The composite estimate of this proportion $p=\frac{1}{2}[p_1+p_2]$ has a variance estimated by $\frac{1}{4}[p_1-p_2]^2=\hat{V}(p)$.

Such variance estimates are easily obtained but, as they have but one degree of freedom, they are themselves highly variable and must be used with caution.

A method, which proves useful particularly when a large number of characteristics are to be estimated, is to determine the ratio of $\hat{V}(p)$ to the binomial variance, that is

$$R = \frac{n(p_1-p_2)^2}{2p(1-p)}$$

where n is the size of the replicated samples. The plot of R versus p may provide a calibration factor which can be used in estimating $\hat{V}(p)$ from the binomial estimate.

2. Sample Selection Procedure

For each sampled Region the sample frame comprised a list of the Secondary Schools within the Boards of Education. The frame also specified the number of English Teachers per school. Two systematic samples of "clusters" of teachers were drawn from this frame using, for each sample, one-half the sampling-ratio specified in Table A.1.

By selecting clusters of teachers, the cost of enumeration can be substantially reduced. The cluster size should be large enough to avoid, if possible, enumerating in "all" schools and to provide an efficient unit for enumeration. The cluster should be small enough so that the sample will not be concentrated in but a few schools.

In some regions it was necessary to group schools together to accommodate the cluster size. Thus the systematic selection provided a sample of school units where the units could be a single school, a group of schools, or a School Board, that is all the secondary schools under a Board. The decision on cluster-size is conditioned by the variance between and within schools and the affordable cost in time, travel, and the desired precision of the estimates.

This method requires determining the number of clusters of the specified size in each unit. From the cumulative table of these measures a systematic sample of clusters is selected. If for example the sampling ratio is 1/r, a random start x between 1 and r is chosen. The sample comprises the xth, x+rth, x+2rth, etc. cluster. These numbers in effect specify the units from which a cluster is to be selected. If a unit with K clusters is selected then the sample is 1/Kth of the English Teachers in that unit.

The sampling ratios, unit size, cluster size and the expected take for each sample at the Design Level are given in Table A.2

Table A.2

SAMPLING RATIOS, UNIT SIZE, CLUSTER SIZE AND THE EXPECTED SAMPLE-TAKE AT THE DESIGN LEVEL; BY REGION

Region	Sampling Ratio (for each sample)	Unit Size	Cluster Size	Expected Sample 1	Sample-Take Sample 2
1	1/8	Schools	5	127	132
2	Take-All	--	--	13	
3	1/8	Board	14	59	58
4	1/7	Schools	6	67	69
5	1/10	Boards	27	84	84
6	1/12	Boards	20	60	62
7	1/10	Boards	22	68	70
1	1/5	Wchools	1	61	61
2	Take-All	--	--	138	
4+5	Take-All	--	--	145	

3. **Response**

As was expected there were a number of sources of non-response, the more important ones are listed below.

a) At the outset of the study all Boards of Education were asked for their support, almost all approved the study but a few refused co-operation and these Boards, listed below, were deleted from the Domain of Study.

Region	Board Refusal	Loss in Sample 1	Loss in Sample 2
1	Etobicoke	24	20
4	Wellington	9	6
	Niagara South	3	6
5	Peel (Strike)	25	0
6	Niagara South	14	0
	Bruce	13	0
7	Peel (Strike)	0	7
1	Etobicoke	2	3

b) The difference between the "expected" and the "actual" sample take reflected changes in the number of teachers in the schools. In most cases these changes were minor but in Region 3 there was a substantial increase and in Region (4+5) a noted decrease in English Teachers in Schools whose highest level was Grade 12. Region 6 also had a decrease in the population of English Teachers.

c) All of the teachers selected under this selection procedure were not in the target group; that is, though classified as English teachers they did not satisfy the survey definition. This effected a reduction of approximately 4 percent in the estimated number of English Teachers.

d) Some teachers were unwilling to complete the questionnaire or did not complete it satisfactorily. These are the non-respondents to the survey.

The statistics relevant to the above four categories are given in Table A.3, as is the estimated response rate achieved after an intensive follow-up of the non-respondents. The follow-up program involved up to three call-backs.

Table A.3

RESPONSE RATES BY REGION

Region	Sample Take		(a) Deleted	(c) Non-Target	Population	(d) Non-Response	Response	Response Rate (%)
	Design	Actual						
1	259	255	44	20	191	103	88	46
2	13	13	0	0	13	1	12	92
3	117	217	0	9	208	98	110	53
4	136	139	24	4	111	23	88	79
5	168	165	50	5	110	53	57	52
6	122	111	27	0	84	19	65	77
7	138	130	7	4	119	40	79	66
1	122	123	5	11	107	49	58	54
2	138	157	0	9	148	74	74	50
4+5	145	108	6	6	96	35	61	63
Total	1358	1418						

The weighted response rate for the survey is approximately 63 percent, an unusually high response rate for a survey of this type. For the tabulations no further adjustment was made for non-respondents and the weights used were defined as the inverse of the response rates by Region by Sample. A further refinement was introduced where all Boards of a Region were drawn into the samples (Regions 1, 2 and 4); in these cases response rates and weights could be calculated for each Board.

4. Estimates of Variance

As noted in Section 1, p. 235 , replicated sampling provided $\hat{V}(p)$, estimates of the variance of the estimated proportion of English Teachers with a specified characteristic. Because of the instability of these variance estimates the ratio of $\hat{V}(p)$ to the theoretical binomial variance was calculated. This ratio:

$$R = \frac{n(p_1-p_2)^2}{2p(1-p)}$$

(where n is the size of each replicated sample), is distributed as a χ^2 with 1 degree of freedom if the sample size is large enough for normal theory to apply. Thus, for large samples, the average value of R should approach the $E(\chi^2_1) = 1$. If this average ratio differs from 1, the R value may be used as a weight factor for the binomial variance. This provides a simple and useful method of estimating $\hat{V}(p)$ when the number of p values is very large.

For a sample size exceeding 150 persons, the Survey values of R for specified ranges of p are given in Table A.4.

Table A.4

R VALUES FOR SPECIFIED LEVELS OF p: (WHEN THE SAMPLE SIZE EXCEEDS 150 PERSONS)

p	Number of Observations	R
0.0-0.1	75	1.01
0.1-0.2	91	1.22
0.2-0.3	72	1.16
0.3-0.4	50	1.07
0.4-0.6	80	1.01

A somewhat crude estimate of variance of p would be the binomial variance weighted by the appropriate R value; crude because the sample is systematic, not random, and the sampling ratio is large. The significance of this table is in its warning that when p is below 0.3 (or above 0.7) the variance is about 20 percent larger than the corresponding binomial variance.

Appendix Two

QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHERS

The questionnaire which follows is part of a study commissioned by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities of the Province of Ontario. The subject of the study is the teaching of expository writing. By this term we mean the writing of essays, editorials, reports and formal, edited composition in general.

This particular part of the study is a survey of a sample of all student teachers in the Province of Ontario. The information gathered in this survey will help us to make recommendations on educational policy. We ask you to co-operate as fully as you can in order to make our recommendations as useful as possible. All responses will be treated with complete confidence: we ask you NOT to place your name anywhere in this document.

Thank you for your help.

Aviva Freedman, Ph.D
Research Associate
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

SECTION I. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Please indicate the type of certificate for which you plan to qualify:

Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type A ☐
Major in: ____________________
Minor in: ____________________
Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B ☐
Major in: ____________________
Minor in: ____________________
Interim Elementary School Teacher's Certificate, Standard 4: ☐
Division: Primary-Junior ☐
Junior-Intermediate: ☐
Interim Vocational Certificate, Type A ☐
Interim Vocational Certificate, Type B ☐
Interim Occupational Type B Certificate ☐
Other ☐

2. What was your age at your last birthday?

under 20 ☐
20 - 21 ☐
22 - 23 ☐
24 - 25 ☐
over 25 ☐

3. Which sex are you? Female ☐
Male ☐

4. Country of birth: Canada ☐
Other (Specify): ____________________

5. If you were born in Canada, which Province or Territory were you born in?

- B.C. ☐
- Alberta ☐
- Saskatchewan ☐
- Manitoba ☐
- Ontario ☐
- Quebec ☐
- New Brunswick ☐
- Nova Scotia ☐
- P.E.I. ☐
- Newfoundland ☐
- N.W.T. ☐
- The Yukon ☐

6. What is your father's occupation? If he is retired or deceased, what was his last occupation? Please be as specific as possible: e.g. instead of "Civil Servant" write "Clerk in Records" etc.

Father's occupation: ______________________________

7. What was the last level of formal education completed by your father?

- Elementary School ☐
- Some High School ☐
- High School ☐
- Some Post-Secondary ☐
- Post-Secondary Diploma ☐
- Bachelor's Degree ☐
- Master's Degree ☐
- Doctorate ☐
- Don't know ☐

8. What is your mother's occupation? If she is retired or deceased, what was her last occupation? Please be as specific as possible.

Mother's occupation: ______________________________

9. What was the last level of formal education completed by your mother?

Elementary School ☐
Some High School ☐
High School ☐
Some Post-Secondary ☐
Post-Secondary Diploma ☐
Bachelor's Degree ☐
Master's Degree ☐
Doctorate ☐
Don't know ☐

10. Where did you get most of your elementary education? ("Most of" means "at least 50%" of)

B.C. ☐
Alberta ☐
Saskatchewan ☐
Manitoba ☐
Ontario ☐
Quebec ☐
New Brunswick ☐
Nova Scotia ☐
P.E.I. ☐
Newfoundland ☐
N.W.T. ☐
The Yukon ☐
Elsewhere (Specify): ____________________

11. Where did you get most of your secondary education? ("Most of" means "at least 50% of")

B.C. ☐
Alberta ☐
Saskatchewan ☐
Manitoba ☐
Ontario ☐
Quebec ☐
New Brunswick ☐
Nova Scotia ☐
P.E.I. ☐
Newfoundland ☐
N.W.T. ☐
The Yukon ☐
Elsewhere (Specify): ____________________

12. What is your highest educational qualification?

Secondary graduation Diploma ☐
Post-Secondary Diploma ☐
Bachelor's Degree ☐
Bachelor's Degree with Honours ☐
Master's Degree ☐
Doctorate ☐
Other (please specify): ____________________

13. If you do not have a university degree, please go to Section II (question 22).

If you do have a university degree, please state the university which awarded your first degree (normally a bachelor's degree or bachelor's degree with honours):

University: ____________________
City: ____________________
Country: ____________________

14. In what subject(s) did you specialize for your first degree?

English ☐
English with another subject (Specify): ____________________
Other language (Specify): ____________________
Other Humanities (Specify): ____________________
Social Science (Specify): ____________________
Natural Science (Specify): ____________________
Other (Specify): ____________________

15. Does your first degree include any courses in English? Yes ☐
No ☐

If you answered "no", please go on to Section II (Question 22).

16. If your undergraduate major was NOT in English, did you nevertheless take any courses in English literature (e.g. The Nineteenth Century Novel, Renaissance Drama, Twentieth Century Poetry, The Canadian Novel, etc.)?

Yes ☐
No ☐

17. If your undergraduate major WAS in English, were you required to take a course in English Language in order to complete the degree?

Not applicable (Major was not English) ☐
Yes ☐
No ☐

18 . If your undergraduate major was English but you were NOT required to take a course in English Language to complete the degree, did you nevertheless take one?

Not applicable	☐
Yes	☐
No	☐

19 . If your first degree did include a course in English Language, please indicate which of the following types of English Language courses you took, and whether it was a half-year or a full-year course:

Inapplicable ☐ or:

	Half-year	Full-year
Old English	☐	☐
Middle English	☐	☐
Old and Middle English	☐	☐
Old Norse	☐	☐
History of the English Language	☐	☐
Structure of Modern English	☐	☐
Survey of Grammatical Theories	☐	☐
Composition and Rhetoric	☐	☐
Other (Specify): ______________________	☐	☐

20 . Did you study any language other than English while completing your first degree?

Yes	☐
No	☐

21. If so, which other language(s) did you study?

Inapplicable	☐
French	☐
Italian	☐
German	☐
Spanish	☐
Russian	☐
Latin	☐
Greek	☐
Classics	☐

Other (Specify): ______________________________________

SECTION II. PRACTICE TEACHING

This section inquires about your practice teaching at grade levels 7 - 13 ONLY. It deals with both classes you observed and your own teaching. If you did not either observe or teach any classes at grades 7 - 13, please go on to question 32.

22. Approximately what percentage of the total time you spent in classes during your practice teaching was spent in observing English or Language Arts classes?

None	☐
Less than 5%	☐
6 - 10%	☐
11 - 15%	☐
16 - 20%	☐
21 - 30%	☐
31 - 40%	☐
41 - 50%	☐
More than 50%	☐

23. Please indicate which grade levels and (if applicable) which streams or phases were being taught in the English or Language Arts courses which you observed.

Grade Level	Remedial	General	Advanced	Enriched	Other
7 - 8		☐			
9 - 10	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11 - 12	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13			☐	☐	☐

24. The next question divides the curriculum of English and Language Arts courses, rather arbitrarily, into four areas: Expository Writing (including essay writing, reports, etc.), Other Composition (including narrative, description, poetry, etc.), Reading or Literature, and Other.

Please indicate for each class which you identified in the previous question approximately what percentage of class time was spent dealing with these four areas:

Grade	Stream or Phase	Expository Writing	Other Composition	Reading or Literature	Other	
7 - 8:		☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Remedial:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	General:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Remedial:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	General:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
13	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
13	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)

25. Approximately what percentage of the total time you spent in classes during your practice teaching was spent in teaching English or Language Arts Classes?

None ☐
Less than 5% ☐
6 - 10% ☐
11 - 15% ☐
16 - 20% ☐
21 - 30% ☐
31 - 40% ☐
41 - 50% ☐
More than 50% ☐

26. Please indicate which grade levels and (if applicable) which streams or phases you taught in your practice teaching of English or Language Arts.

Grade Level	Remedial	General	Advanced	Enriched	Other
7 - 8		☐			
9 - 10	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11 -12	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13			☐	☐	☐

27. To what extent were you free to choose the streams or phases and the grade levels which you taught.

Streams or Phases:	Not at all	Very Little	To some Extent	To a great Extent
	☐	☐	☐	☐

Grade Levels:	Not at all	Very Little	To some Extent	To a great Extent
	☐	☐	☐	☐

28. Like question 24, the next question divides the curriculum of English and Language Arts classes into four areas: Expository Writing, Other Composition, Reading or Literature, and Other.

29. Please indicate for each class which you identified in question 26 approximately what percentage of class time was spent on each of these four areas:

Grade level	Stream or Phase	Expository Writing	Other Composition	Reading or Literature	Other	
7 - 8:		☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Remedial:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	General:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
9 - 10	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Remedial:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	General:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
11 - 12	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
13	Advanced:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)
13	Enriched:	☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)

30. To what extent did you have a choice as to the English subject or Language Arts subject matter you taught (e.g. expository writing, other composition, grammar, literature, etc.)?

Not at all	Very Little	To some Extent	To a great Extent
☐	☐	☐	☐

31. How useful were your associate teacher's comments in pointing out the strengths and weaknesses in your English practice teaching?

Of little Use	Somewhat Useful	Quite Useful	Very Useful
☐	☐	☐	☐

32. Please add any additional comments you would like to make about your practice teaching as a whole.

SECTION III. ATTITUDES TOWARDS ASPECTS OF LITERACY

In each of the questions which follow, three views are expressed about issues connected with the teaching of writing. Please indicate which of the three positions, in each case, most closely conforms to your own view

33 .a. "Pupils should be taught how to write in English courses and by English teachers; teachers in other courses should be able to take the writing abilities of their students for granted." ☐

b. "Writing should be taught primarily by English teachers, but all teachers have at least a limited responsibility to develop the writing abilities of their pupils." ☐

c. "All teachers, whether English specialists or not, have a major responsibility for developing pupils' writing abilities." ☐

34 .a. "Training pupils in the principles of traditional 'prescriptive' grammar serves no good purpose, and represents a misguided and outdated approach towards developing writing abilities." ☐

b. "Young students acquire much of the grammar of their native language naturally, but formal training in traditional grammatical principles, at appropriate stages in their development, can refine their writing abilities by helping them to use language with precision and clarity." ☐

c. "Training in the principles of traditional grammar is immensely important for the development of writing abilities. Such training should begin in the early years, and should be reinforced throughout the student's career." ☐

35 .a. "Spelling and punctuation are the least important aspects of writing; the teacher who frequently corrects such errors is likely to discourage the student and impede the development of writing abilities." ☐

b. "Spelling and punctuation are not to be discounted. The teacher should offer the student some training in both." ☐

c. "Spelling and punctuation have a central place in the spectrum of writing abilities; pupils leaving school must be able to spell correctly and punctuate appropriately." ☐

36 .a. "In the modern 'audio-visual' world, writing is becoming less and less important in the practical day-to-day life of the average citizen: unless a pupil is eager to acquire writing abilities, the teacher should not give undue attention to their development." ☐

37.b. "In recent years the basic writing skills have been underemphasized in the school system. The pendulum has swung too far; the schools should place more emphasis on writing abilities, but should be careful not to overemphasize their importance." ☐

c. "It is essential that citizens should be able to read and write adequately. Practical considerations are not the only issue; the citizen who lacks skills in reading and writing is at the mercy of the political system, and is also deprived of enjoying many benefits of his cultural heritage. The importance of training students to read intelligently and to write well cannot be overemphasized." ☐

SECTION IV. SOCIOLINGUISTIC TOPICS: SURVEY OF PERCEPTIONS

Please indicate whether during the past year you have studied any of the following linguistic topics in relation to the teaching of English or the Language Arts:

38. Sociolinguistics and theories of linguistic standards: Yes ☐ No ☐

39. Traditional grammar: Yes ☐ No ☐

40. Structural or descriptive grammar: Yes ☐ No ☐

41. Transformational-generative grammar: Yes ☐ No ☐

42. Systemic (Scale and Category) grammar: Yes ☐ No ☐

43. Semantics: Yes ☐ No ☐

Please indicate whether during the past year you have been taught any special methodologies or techniques for teaching writing to the following minority groups:

44. Pupils from economically disadvantaged backgrounds: Yes ☐ No ☐

45. English as a Second Language: Yes ☐ No ☐

46. English as a Second Dialect: Yes ☐ No ☐

47. Francophones: Yes ☐ No ☐

48. Native peoples Yes ☐ No ☐

49. Have you, during the past year, heard any discussions of, or lectures on, the phenomenon of "teacher expectancy"? Yes ☐ No ☐

50. Have you been taught any methods to overcome the pedagogical problems arising from teacher expectancies? Yes ☐ No ☐

SECTION V. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND IN RELATION TO EXPOSITORY WRITING

The following questions ask you to evaluate the quality of your own training in expository writing at the various stages of your academic career. (Interpret the concept of 'Training' broadly, so that it includes both formal and informal methods. For example, the effective marking of written assignments should be considered to be a form of training).

51. At High School, instruction in expository writing was:

Non-existent ☐
Poor ☐
Fair ☐
Good ☐
Excellent ☐

52. At Community College or C.E.G.E.P., instruction in expository writing was:

Inapplicable, did not attend Community College ☐
Non-existent ☐
Poor ☐
Fair ☐
Good ☐
Excellent ☐

53. Please evaluate the quality of training which you received prior to this year as an undergraduate, both formally and informally, in such compositional skills as clarity of exposition and cogency of argumentation.

Inapplicable. did not attend University before this year ☐
Non existent ☐
Poor ☐
Fair ☐
Good ☐
Excellent ☐

54. Please evaluate the quality of training which you received prior to this year as an undergraduate, both formally and informally, in compositional skills such as grammar, spelling and word usage.

Inapplicable, did not attend University before this year ☐
Non-existent ☐
Poor ☐
Fair ☐
Good ☐
Excellent ☐

SECTION VI. EMPHASIS ON WRITING IN COURSES OTHER THAN SPECIALIZED AND LANGUAGE COURSES

This section deals with courses in subjects other than English and Language Arts at your Faculty of Education or O.T.E.C. and inquires about the extent to which writing was emphasized in them.

The following list groups typical courses at Faculties of Education or Teacher Education Colleges under six headings which represent general areas of study. Please note that English and Language Arts courses as well as specialized courses in writing skills have been deliberately excluded.

55. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking at least one course in the area of Educational Foundations which is similar or identical to those listed.

e.g. Contemporary issues in education
History of education
Philosophy of education
Educational Psychology
Sociology

Yes ☐

No ☐

56. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking at least one course in Curriculum. A number of courses are listed for exemplification, but the list is not meant to be exhaustive.

e.g. Art
Biology
Chemistry
Dramatic Arts
Economics
Environmental Studies
French
Geography
German

Guidance
History
Man in Society
Mathematics
Music
Physical and Health Education
Physics
Political Science
School Librarianship
Social Science
etc.

Yes ☐

No ☐

57. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking any course in Special forms of education such as Community Education or Adult Basic Education and Retraining.

Yes ☐
No ☐

58. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking any course in Teaching Skills, such as Curriculum Design, Measurement and Evaluation or Educational Media

Yes ☐
No ☐

59. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking any course in Technical and Practical Education, such as Technical Studies, Vocational Studies or Home Economics

Yes ☐
No ☐

60. Please indicate whether you have taken or are taking any course in Special Interests or Electives, such as Open Country Explorations, The Teacher as T.V. Producer, Private Studies, etc.

Yes ☐

No ☐

61. To what extent have your written assignments in courses in each of these six areas been marked in such a way as to indicate to you any deficiencies or inadequacies in your own writing in such matters as spelling and punctuation, grammar and usage, sentence and paragraph construction, clarity of expression, etc.?

	Not at all	Very Little	To some Extent	To a Great Extent
Educational Foundations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Special Forms of Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teaching Skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technical/Practical Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Special Interests or Electives	☐	☐	☐	☐

62. During these courses, to what extent have the instructors stressed that you have a responsibility to teach your future students effective writing skills?

	Not at all	Very Little	To some Extent	To a Great Extent
Educational Foundations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
Special Forms of Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teaching Skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technical/Practical Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
Special Interests or Electives	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION VII. ENGLISH AND LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES ONLY

Please answer this question only if you are taking, or have taken, one or more specialist courses in the teaching of English or the Language Arts at your Faculty of Education or Teacher Education College. For the purposes of this section, please discount any still more specialized course which you may be taking or have taken which dealt chiefly with the teaching of composition or expository writing. The concern in this section is not with specialized writing courses but with "normal" English or Language Arts courses. If you have not taken such a course at all, please go on to Section VIII (question 69).

63. In your English or Language Arts courses, approximately what was the proportional emphasis on literature or reading, language study (including oral language and formal or analytic grammar), and writing of all kinds?

Literature or Reading	Language Study	All Writing	Other	
☐%	☐%	☐%	☐%	(100%)

64. Of the part of your English or Language Arts course(s) devoted to teaching you how to teach pupils to write, approximately what proportion was devoted specifically to expository writing and what proportion to other kinds of writing (e.g. poetry, narrative, description, etc.)?

Expository Writing	Other Writing	
☐%	☐%	(100%)

65. Of the part of your English or Language Arts course(s) devoted to teaching you to teach pupils to write expository writing, approximately what proportions were devoted to:

(a) what pupils should know about exposition (e.g. essay structure, paragraph development, etc.)? ☐%

(b) methods and techniques to use in teaching exposition (e.g. motivation, preliminary oral preparation, how to make a class lively and interesting, etc.)? ☐%

(c) preparing you to teach at different grade levels in the school system? ☐%

(d) preparing you to teach to pupils whose socio-economic backgrounds cause special pedagogical problems (e.g. economically disadvantaged, E.S.L. and E.S.D. immigrants, francophones, native peoples, etc.)? ☐%

(e) Other topics ☐%

100%

66. To what extent did you have an opportunity in your practice teaching to put into practice any of the topics listed in the previous question?

	Not at all	Very Little	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent	To a Very Great Extent
(a) Teaching about exposition:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) Methods and classroom techniques:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Exposition at different grade levels:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) Exposition for pupils with special pedagogical problems for socio-economic reasons	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

67. Were written assignments required of you in this course? Yes ☐ No ☐

68. If so, to what extent were your written assignments marked in such a way as to reveal to you the strengths and weaknesses of your own writing?

☐ Not applicable; OR

Not at all.	Very Little	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent	To a Very Great Extent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION VIII. SPECIALIZED COURSES IN THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION

Please answer this section only if you have taken or are taking a specialized course at your Faculty of Education or Teacher Education College in which the primary concern was teaching you theories, methods and content for teaching composition to school pupils. If you have not taken such a course, please go on to the last section.

69. In your specialized course in the teaching of composition, approximately what percentage was devoted to (a) what pupils should know about specific kinds of writing (e.g. expository writing, narrative, description); (b) methods and techniques to use in teaching writing; (c) preparing you to teach at different grade levels; (d) special methods or techniques for use in teaching pupils from socio-economic backgrounds which cause special pedagogical problems in the teaching of writing; and (e) other topics?

(a) Kinds of writing ☐%

(b) Classroom methods and techniques ☐%

(c) Different grade levels ☐%

(d) Pupils whose socio-economic backgrounds cause special problems ☐%

(e) Other topics ☐%

100%

70. To what extent did you have an opportunity to put each of these topics into practice in the course of your practice teaching?

	Not at all	Very Little	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent	To a Great Extent
(a) Kinds of writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) Classroom methods and techniques	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Different grade levels	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) Pupils whose socio-economic backgrounds cause pedagogical problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

71. Of the part of your specialized writing course devoted to what pupils should know about specific kinds of writing, approximately what proportion was devoted to formal expository writing in comparison to all other kinds of writing?

Formal expository	All other	
☐%	☐%	(100%)

72. To what extent did you have an opportunity during your practice teaching to teach formal expository writing as compared to all other kinds of writing?

	Not at all	Very Little	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent	Very Great
Formal expository writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
All other kinds of writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

73. Were you yourself required to complete writing assignments as part of your work for this course? Yes ☐ No ☐

74. If so, to what extent were they marked in such a way as to reveal to you the strengths and weaknesses of your own writing?

☐ Not applicable; OR:

Not at all	Very Little	To a Moderate Extent	To a Considerable Extent	To a very Great Extent
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION IX.

Please add any other comments you would like to make about any of the topics and issues raised in this questionnaire.

Appendix Three

The Department of English
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
KIS 5B6

May 20, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Another questionnaire! Actually, it is not as long as it looks: please bear with us.

It is part of a study being conducted by a group of researchers at Carleton University under contract to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in Ontario. This study is concerned with the training of teachers, specifically with the kind of training teachers get both in universities and Faculties or Colleges of Education, and the extent to which it is adequate preparation for teaching writing, especially that branch of writing which is called transactional writing or exposition.

As a practising teacher, your evaluation of your own background is more important to our study than any of the other kinds of information we are amassing. For this reason, we urge you to fill out this questionnaire, and to do so as candidly as possible. Needless to say, complete anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained, and we would ask you not to put your name on the questionnaire.

It is divided up into six sections. The first two are basically background information necessary for comparative studies and for interpreting the results. The third and the last section are concerned in different ways with your opinions about certain aspects of writing in the schools and society. The heart of the questionnaire is the fourth and fifth sections, which ask about your university training and the rest of your education as a teacher.

Because it may sometime be difficult to focus specifically on exposition or transactional writing, we have usually asked about it in relation to other kinds of writing and language skills related to writing. We do not want to define these too narrowly, since what they may be taken to mean will depend on your own views about your subject as well as the grade levels and ability levels of your classes. In general terms, we intend the term "Writing of all kinds" to include what James Britton has called "poetic writing" (writing which uses language primarily as an artistic medium -- typically, but not necessarily, the writing of poetry), "expressive" writing (writing which is as much about the writer as for the audience -- perhaps

.../2

including diaries, personal letters to friends or relations, and so on), and "transactional" writing (writing which uses language to get things done, for example by advising, persuading, instructing or informing). The term thus includes all kinds of creative writing, as well as the three parts of the traditional breakdown of composition into description, narrative and exposition. If your teaching also includes such subjects as sentence combining or the writing of paragraphs as preliminary work for longer assignments or as units by themselves, then this too should be considered part of "writing". On the other hand, the term is not meant to include reading or other kinds of experience on which writing might be based, nor any oral work which is preliminary or ancillary to writing.

In addition to the category "writing of all kinds", we have asked questions about "language skills related to writing". To an even greater degree, the definition of these depends on your own views and the levels and abilities of the students you teach. Depending on these, related language skills might include such topics as the mechanics of writing (spelling, punctuation, etc.), correct usage, other aspects of traditional grammar, levels of discourse and usage, other kinds of grammar (such as transformational, structural or systemic), work in semantics or vocabulary building, and so on. If it is possible to do so (and we realize that it may not be easy for a teacher working with a carefully integrated syllabus), we would like you to exclude again language skills which are predominantly or exclusively oral, or do not relate directly to writing.

Thirdly, within the category of "writing of all kinds", we ask you to distinguish "exposition" particularly. Here the definition should be taken to refer to completed pieces of formal edited writing such as compositions on literary topics, research projects, expository essays, and so on.

Please note that although we ask about all of these things (and in Section C ask about some of them more specifically), we do not mean to imply that all teachers are teaching about or working with all of them, still less that all teachers should be doing so. Our only assumption is that some teachers may be doing so.

We would very much like to promise you a set of the study based on the results of this survey. Unfortunately we cannot do so, since publication of the results is the prerogative of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. What we can and will do, however is ask for his permission to circulate a very brief report to the respondents to let them know when the study is complete, at the end of next October.

In the meantime, we look forward to receiving your response to the questionnaire. We believe that your opinions will make the whole study more worthwhile. Thank you for your time.

Yours truly,

Aviva Freedman

Aviva Freedman,
Project Coordinator

Please do not wri
in this space

SECTION A - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please provide the following background information:

1. The Teaching Certificate you now hold:
   - Interim High School Assistant, Type A ☐ 0
   - Interim High School Assistant, Type B ☐ 1
   - Permanent High School Specialist ☐ 2
   - Permanent High School Assistant ☐ 3
   - E.S.T. 4 ☐ 4
   - E.S.T. 3 ☐ 5
   - E.S.T. 2 ☐ 6
   - E.S.T. 1 ☐ 7
   - Other (Please specify): ☐ 8

2. Your age, to the closest year: ___ ___

3. Your sex: Female ☐ 0 Male ☐ 1

4. Country of birth:
   Canada ☐ Other (please specify): ____________________

5. If you were born in Canada, which Province or Territory were you born in?
   - British Columbia ☐ 15
   - Alberta ☐ 16
   - Saskatchewan ☐ 17
   - Manitoba ☐ 18
   - Ontario ☐ 19
   - Quebec ☐ 20
   - New Brunswick ☐ 21
   - Nova Scotia ☐ 22
   - P.E.I. ☐ 23
   - Newfoundland ☐ 24
   - N.W.T. ☐ 25
   - The Yukon ☐ 26

6. What is or was your father's main occupation during his life? Please be as specific as possible: e.g. instead of "Civil servant" write "Clerk in Records Office", etc.
   Father's occupation: ______________________________

7. What was the last level of formal education your father completed?
   - None ☐ 0
   - Elementary School ☐ 1
   - Some High School ☐ 2
   - High School ☐ 3
   - Some Post-Secondary ☐ 4
   - Post-Secondary Diploma ☐ 5
   - Bachelor's Degree ☐ 6
   - Master's Degree ☐ 7
   - Doctorate ☐ 8
   - Don't know ☐ 9

Please do not writ
in this space

8. What is or was your Mother's main occupation during her life? Please be as specific as possible.

Mother's occupation: ______________________________

9. What was the last level of formal education completed by your mother?

None ☐ 0
Elementary School ☐ 1
Some High School ☐ 2
High School ☐ 3
Some Post-Secondary ☐ 4
Post-Secondary Diploma ☐ 5
Bachelor's Degree ☐ 6
Master's Degree ☐ 7
Doctorate ☐ 8
Don't Know ☐ 9

10. Are you now, or have you ever been, an Associate or Host Teacher?

No ☐ 0 Yes ☐ 1

If so, for how long were you or have you been an Associate or Host Teacher?

__________ Academic year(s)

11. Are you now, or have you ever been, on the Faculty of any Teacher Education Institution?

No ☐ 0 Yes ☐ 1

SECTION B - PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Please do not writ· in this space

Section B is concerned with your teaching duties in English or Language Arts during this school year. It is divided into four parts to take account of different ways in which teaching duties may be divided up, especially at the Grade 7 and 8 level. Please answer only the part or parts most applicable to your own situation.

Part 1: One Class at the 7 or 8 level, All Subjects

Answer Part 1 if you teach all subjects or all but one or two to one class at the grade 7 or 8 level. Part 1 starts at question 12.

Part 2: Home-Room at Grade 7 or 8 Level combined with Rotation

Answer Part 2 if you have a home-room class at the grade 7 or 8 level to which you teach Language Arts and some other subject(s) half a day, and teach other classes in a rotating system for the remainder of the day. Part 2 starts at question 22.

Part 3: Rotating System at the Intermediate Level

Answer Part 3 if you teach in a rotating system and teach Language Arts to 1-7 classes at the Intermediate level. Part 3 starts at question 40.

Part 4: Secondary English

Answer Part 4 if you teach any English classes in grades 9-13. It starts at question 51.

Note: Combined Intermediate and Secondary

If you teach both 7 and 8 Language Arts as well as some Secondary English, please answer Part 4 as well as either Part 2 or Part 3 (whichever is more applicable to your situation).

Part 1: Grade 7 or 8 teachers teaching all or most subjects to one class.

12. Please identify the grade and (if applicable) the ability level of your present class.

Grade: ___ ___ Ability Level: ______________________________ ___ ___

13. What is the enrolment in this class? _______ students ___ ___

14. In one week, how many hours do you spend with this class?

Hours in class: _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___

Please do not writ
in this space

15. In a typical week, approximately how many hours are devoted either directly or indirectly (for example, in association with the Social Studies syllabus) to Language Arts?

Hours in Language Arts: ________ per week   ___ ___ ___

16. Of the total time devoted directly or indirectly to Language Arts in a typical week, approximately how many hours are devoted to teaching about and practice in writing of all kinds?

Hours for writing: ________ per week   ___ ___ ___

17. Of the total amount of time devoted to language arts, approximately how many hours per week are devoted to teaching about and practice in Language skills related to writing?

Hours for related language skills: ________ hours per week   ___ ___ ___

18. Of the total amount of time devoted to writing of all kinds (compare question 16) during the year, approximately what percentage, if any, is devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

Exposition: _ _ %   ___ ___

All other writing: _ _ %

1 0 0 %

19. Do you have a syllabus or core curriculum in Language Arts drawn up by your Board or School which you are supposed to follow fairly closely?

0 ☐ No   ___
1 ☐ Yes, a School syllabus
2 ☐ Yes, a Board syllabus

20. Do you have marking assistance?

No ☐ 0 Yes ☐ 1   ___

21. How many hours per week do you have scheduled free for marking, preparation, etc.?

Preparation Hours: ________ per week   ___ ___

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS PART OF SECTION B, PLEASE SKIP THE REMAINING PARTS OF THIS SECTION AND GO ON TO QUESTION 72 (SECTION C).

Please do not wri
in this space

Part 2: Please answer this Part of Section B if you are a grade 7 or or 8 teacher teaching a home-room for half a day, whether or not you teach additional classes for the remainder of the day.

22. Do you teach additional classes, on a rotating basis, over and above your home-room duties?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, skip to question 29.

Yes ☐ 1

If so, how many hours per week do you spend with classes other than your home-room class?

Total work load in rotating classes: ______ hours per week

23. Do you teach Language Arts to any of these other classes?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, skip to question 29.

Yes ☐ 1

24. If so, please identify, by grade and ability level (if applicable) each of the additional classes to which you teach Language Arts.

	Grade Level	Ability Level
Class 1	______	______
Class 2	______	______
Class 3	______	______
Class 4	______	______

25. Please indicate, for each of these additional classes, how many hours per week are devoted to teaching about and practice in writing skills of all kinds.

	All types of writing skills
Class 1	______ hours per week
Class 2	______ hours per week
Class 3	______ hours per week
Class 4	______ hours per week

26. Please indicate, for each of these additional classes, how many hours per week are devoted to teaching about and practice in language skills related to writing

	Language skills related to writing
Class 1	______ hours per week
Class 2	______ hours per week
Class 3	______ hours per week
Class 4	______ hours per week

Please do not writ
in this space

27. Of the total amount of time devoted to writing of all kinds (compare question 25) during the year in each of these classes, approximately what percentage, if any, is devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

Percentage of writing time that is Exposition

Class 1 ☐☐ % ___ ___
Class 2 ☐☐ % ___ ___
Class 3 ☐☐ % ___ ___
Class 4 ☐☐ % ___ ___

28. What is the enrolment of each of the additional classes to which you teach Language Arts?

Enrolment

Class 1 ____________ students ___ ___
Class 2 ____________ students ___ ___
Class 3 ____________ students ___ ___
Class 4 ____________ students ___ ___

29. What grade level and (if applicable) ability level is your home-room class?

Grade: ______ Ability level: __________________ ___ ___

30. How many hours per week do you spend with your home-room class?

______________ hours per week ___ ___ ___

31. What is the enrolment of your home-room class?

Enrolment: __________ students ___ ___

32. Do you teach Language Arts to your home-room class?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, skip to question 72, Section C. ___
Yes ☐ 1

33. If so, approximately how many hours in a typical week are devoted, either directly or indirectly (e.g. in association with the Social Studies syllabus) to Language Arts?

Hours in Language Arts: ___________ per week ___ ___ ___

34. Of the total time spent in teaching Language Arts to your home-room class, how many hours in a typical week are devoted to teaching about and practice in writing skills of all kinds?

All writing skills: _______ hours per week ___ ___

Please do not writ
in this space

35. Of the total time spent in teaching Language Arts to your home-room class, how many hours are devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in language skills related to writing?

Related language skills: ____________ hours per week

36. Of the total amount of time devoted to writing of all kinds (compare question 34) during the year in your home-room class, approximately what percentage, if any, is devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

Exposition: ☐☐ %
All other writing: ☐☐ %
1 0 0 %

37. Do you have marking assistance?

No ☐ 0   Yes ☐ 1

38. How many hours per week do you have scheduled free to prepare classes and mark assignments, etc.?

Preparation time: ________ hours per week

39. Do you have a syllabus or core curriculum in Language Arts drawn up by your Board or School which you are supposed to follow fairly closely?

0 ☐ No
1 ☐ Yes, a School syllabus
2 ☐ Yes, a Board syllabus

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS PART OF SECTION B AND YOU ARE NOT TEACHING ANY ENGLISH COURSES IN GRADE 9 AND UP, PLEASE SKIP THE REMAINING PARTS OF THIS SECTION AND GO ON TO QUESTION 72 (SECTION C).

IF YOU ARE TEACHING SOME SECONDARY ENGLISH, PLEASE GO ON TO PART 4, QUESTION 51.

Please do not writ
in this space

Part 3: Please answer this Part of Section B if you teach in a rotating system and have one or more Language Arts classes at the grade 7 or 8 level.

40. Are you a part-time or full-time teacher?

Part-time ☐ 0 Full-time ☐ 1

41. How many hours per week do you teach?

Teaching load: ________ hours per week

42. Please identify the Language Arts classes you teach in grades 7 or 8 by grade and (if applicable) ability level.

	Grade Level	Ability Level
Class 1		
Class 2		
Class 3		
Class 4		
Class 5		
Class 6		
Class 7		

43. What is the enrolment of the classes in Language Arts which you teach at grades 7 and/or 8?

	Enrolment	
Class 1	________	students
Class 2	________	students
Class 3	________	students
Class 4	________	students
Class 5	________	students
Class 6	________	students
Class 7	________	students

44. How many hours per week do you spend in each of the Language Arts classes you teach in grades 7 and/or 8?

	Total class time	
Class 1	________	hours per week
Class 2	________	hours per week
Class 3	________	hours per week
Class 4	________	hours per week
Class 5	________	hours per week
Class 6	________	hours per week
Class 7	________	hours per week

Please do not wri
in this space

45. Of the total time you spend in each class how many hours do you devote in a typical week to teaching about and practice in writing of all kinds?

Writing

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 7 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___

46. Of the total time spent in teaching Language Arts to each class, how many hours are devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in language skills related to writing?

Related language skills

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 7 ________ hours per week ___ ___ ___

47. Of the total time devoted to writing of all kinds (compare question 45) during the year in each of these classes, approximately what percentage, if any, is devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

Percentage of writing time that is Exposition

Class 1 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 2 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 3 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 4 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 5 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 6 ☐☐ ___ ___
Class 7 ☐☐ ___ ___

Please do not writ
in this space

48. Do you have marking assistance?

No ☐ 0 Yes ☐ 1

___

49. How many hours per week do you have scheduled free for preparation, marking, etc.?

Preparation time: _________ hours per week

___ ___ ___

50. Do you have a syllabus or core curriculum in Language Arts drawn up by your Board or School which you are supposed to follow fairly closely?

0 ☐ No
1 ☐ Yes, a School syllabus
2 ☐ Yes, a Board syllabus

___

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS PART OF SECTION B AND YOU ARE NOT TEACHING ANY ENGLISH COURSES IN GRADE 9 AND UP, PLEASE SKIP THE REMAINING PARTS OF THIS SECTION AND GO ON TO QUESTION 72 (SECTION C).

IF YOU ARE TEACHING SOME SECONDARY ENGLISH, PLEASE GO ON TO PART 4, QUESTION 51.

Please do not wri
in this space

Part 4: Please answer this Part of Section B if you teach one or more classes of English to students in grades 9-13.

51. Are you a part-time or full-time teacher?

Part-time ☐ 0 Full-time ☐ 1

52. How many hours per week do you teach?

Teaching load is _______ hours per week

53. Is the year divided into two semesters in your school?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip to question 61

Yes ☐ 1

54. If so, please identify by course number, level (1-5) and phase each of the English courses which you taught in grades 9-13 this year.

(a) First Semester:

	Course #	Level	Phase
Class 1			
Class 2			
Class 3			
Class 4			
Class 5			
Class 6			

(b) Second Semester

	Course #	Level	Phase
Class 1			
Class 2			
Class 3			
Class 4			
Class 5			
Class 6			

Please do not wri
in this space

55. Please indicate the enrolment of each of the English classes you taught at grades 9-13 in semester courses.

(a) First Semester

Enrolment

Class 1 ________ students ___ ___
Class 2 ________ students ___ ___
Class 3 ________ students ___ ___
Class 4 ________ students ___ ___
Class 5 ________ students ___ ___
Class 6 ________ students ___ ___

(b) Second Semester

Enrolment

Class 1 ________ students ___ ___
Class 2 ________ students ___ ___
Class 3 ________ students ___ ___
Class 4 ________ students ___ ___
Class 5 ________ students ___ ___
Class 6 ________ students ___ ___

56. For how many hours per week did each of these classes meet?

(a) First Semester

Class time

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Please do not wri
in this space

(b) Second Semester

Class time

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

57. In each class, how many hours were devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in writing of all kinds?

(a) First Semester

Writing

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

(b) Second Semester

Writing

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

58. In each class, how many hours were devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in language skills related to writing?

(a) First Semester

Related language skills

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___
Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Please do not write in this space

(b) Second Semester

Related language skills

Class 1 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Class 2 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Class 3 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Class 4 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Class 5 ________ hours per week ___ ___

Class 6 ________ hours per week ___ ___

59. Of the total time devoted in each semester to writing skills of all kinds (compare question 57) approximately what percentage, if any, was devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

(a) First Semester

Percentage of writing time that is Exposition

Class 1 ________ % ___ ___

Class 2 ________ % ___ ___

Class 3 ________ % ___ ___

Class 4 ________ % ___ ___

Class 5 ________ % ___ ___

Class 6 ________ % ___ ___

(b) Second Semester

Percentage of writing time that is Exposition

Class 1 ________ % ___ ___

Class 2 ________ % ___ ___

Class 3 ________ % ___ ___

Class 4 ________ % ___ ___

Class 5 ________ % ___ ___

Class 6 ________ % ___ ___

Please do not writ
in this space

60. Approximately how much writing, measured in number of words, did you require of the students in these courses?

(a) First Semester

Students' Assignments

Class 1 ________ words
Class 2 ________ words
Class 3 ________ words
Class 4 ________ words
Class 5 ________ words
Class 6 ________ words

(b) Second Semester

Students' Assignments

Class 1 ________ words
Class 2 ________ words
Class 3 ________ words
Class 4 ________ words
Class 5 ________ words
Class 6 ________ words

61. Did you teach any courses in English which extended throughout the whole year (i.e. from Sept. - June) in grades 9-13 this year?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip to question ~~60~~ 69
Yes ☐ 1

62. Please identify by course number, level (1-5) and phase each of the classes in grades 9-13 to which you taught an English course this year.

	Course #	Level	Phase
Class 1			
Class 2			
Class 3			
Class 4			
Class 5			
Class 6			

Please do not write in this space

63. What is the enrolment of each of the classes in grades 9-13 to which you taught an English course this year?

Enrolment

Class 1 __________ students ___ ___
Class 2 __________ students ___ ___
Class 3 __________ students ___ ___
Class 4 __________ students ___ ___
Class 5 __________ students ___ ___
Class 6 __________ students ___ ___

64. For how many hours per week did each of these classes meet?

Class time

Class 1 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 2 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 3 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 4 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 5 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 6 _________ hours per week ___ ___ ___

65. In each class, how many hours were devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in writing of all kinds?

Writing

Class 1 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 2 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 3 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 4 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 5 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 6 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___

66. In each class, how many hours were devoted in a typical week to teaching about and practice in language skills related to writing?

Related language skills

Class 1 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 2 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 3 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 4 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 5 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___
Class 6 _______ hours per week ___ ___ ___

Please do not wr
in this space

67. Of the total time devoted to writing skills of all kinds in these classes, approximately what percentage, if any, was devoted directly to teaching about and practice in exposition?

Percentage of writing time that is Exposition

Class 1 ______ % ___ ___
Class 2 ______ % ___ ___
Class 3 ______ % ___ ___
Class 4 ______ % ___ ___
Class 5 ______ % ___ ___
Class 6 ______ % ___ ___

68. Approximately how much writing, measured in number of words, did you require of the students in these courses?

Students' Assignments

Class 1 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___
Class 2 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___
Class 3 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___
Class 4 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___
Class 5 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___
Class 6 ______ words ___ ___ ___ ___

69. Do you have any marking assistance?

No ☐ 0
Yes ☐ 1

___

70. How many hours per week do you have scheduled free for preparation and marking, etc.?

Preparation time: ______ hours per week ___ ___ ___

71. Do you have a syllabus or core curriculum in Language Arts drawn up by your Board or School which you are supposed to follow fairly closely?

0 ☐ No
1 ☐ Yes, a School syllabus
2 ☐ Yes, a Board syllabus

___

Please do not write in this space

SECTION C - IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN SKILLS

Part 1: Language Skills

In your opinion, how important are teaching about and practice in the following language skills in the education of the average student at the grade levels indicated?

As nearly as possible, please give your opinion as an absolute or an ideal, without necessarily taking into account the amount of time or the relative emphasis you might give to any of these in your own classes.

	0. Relatively Unimportant	1. Fairly Important	2. Very Important	3. Can't Say	
72. The three aspects of traditional school grammar:					
A. Definition of parts of speech:					
Grades 7-8					
Grades 9-10					
Grades 11-12					
Grade 13					
B. Parsing and identifying grammatical structures and functions:					
Grades 7-8					
Grades 9-10					
Grades 11-12					
Grade 13					
C. Learning correct usages:					
Grades 7-8					
Grades 9-10					
Grades 11-12					
Grade 13					
73. Descriptive grammar (Structural, transformational or systemic):					
Grades 7-8					
Grades 9-10					
Grades 11-12					
Grade 13					

	0. Relatively Unimportant	1. Fairly Important	2. Very Important	3. Can't Say	Please do not writ in this space
74. **Levels of usage and variation according to situation, medium, etc.**					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	___
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	___
75. **Regional variation in language**					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	___
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	___
76. **Semantics**					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	___
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	___
77. **Mechanical skills (Spelling and punctuation)**					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	___
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	___
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	___

Part 2: Writing skills

In your opinion, how important is the practice of the following writing skills in the education of the average student at the grade levels indicated?

As nearly as possible, please give your opinion as an absolute or ideal, without necessarily taking into account the amount of time or the relative emphasis you might give to any of these in your own classes.

	0. Relatively Unimportant	1. Fairly Important	2. Very Important	3. Can't Say	Please do not write in this space
78. Poetic writing:					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
79. Expressive writing					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
80. Exposition generally					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____

Part 3: Specific skills relating particularly to exposition

In your opinion, how important are teaching about and practice in the following writing skills, particularly in relation to exposition, in the education of average students at the grade levels indicated?

As nearly as possible, please give your opinion once again as an absolute or ideal, without necessarily taking into account the amount of time or the relative emphasis you might give to any of these in your own classes.

	0. Relatively Unimportant	1. Fairly Important	2. Very Important	3. Can't Say	Please do not writ in this space
81. Making outlines and analysing topics					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
82. Reasoning and evidence					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
83. Gathering and classifying material (research techniques)					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
84. Paragraph structure					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____
85. Revision and editing					
Grades 7-8	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 9-10	____	____	____	____	____
Grades 11-12	____	____	____	____	____
Grade 13	____	____	____	____	____

Please do not wri
in this space

SECTION D - UNIVERSITY COURSES AND THEIR USEFULNESS

86. Have you ever completed any credit courses at a university?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip this section and go on to question 106 (Section E) ___

Yes ☐ 1

87. If so, do you have a university degree?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please go to question 94 ___

Yes ☐ 1

88. Do you have a Ph.D.?

No ☐ 0 ___

Yes ☐ 1

89. Do you have a Master's degree?

No ☐ 0 ___

Yes ☐ 1

If so, please provide the following information:

Discipline: ______________________ ___

Year of graduation: 19___ ___ ___

University: ______________________ ___ ___

City: ______________________

Country: ______________________

01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14

15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33

34	35

90. Do you have an Honours Bachelor's degree?

No ☐ 0 ___

Yes ☐ 1

If so, please provide the following information:

Year of graduation: 19___ ___ ___

University: ______________________ ___ ___

City: ______________________

Country: ______________________

01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14

15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33

34	35

Please do not wri
in this space

91. In what subject(s) did you specialize for your Honours Bachelor's degree?

N/A, I did not take an Honours degree ☐ 0
English ☐ 1
English with another subject (specify) ____________ 2
Other Language (specify) ____________ 3
Other Humanities (specify) ____________ 4
Social Science (specify) ____________ 5
Natural Science (specify) ____________ 6
Other (specify) ____________ 7

92. Do you have a Bachelor's degree?

No ☐ 0
Yes ☐ 1

If so, please provide the following information:

Year of graduation: 19___
University: ____________
City: ____________
Country: ____________

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33
34 35

93. In which subject(s) did you specialize for your Bachelor's degree?

N/A, I did not take a Bachelor's degree ☐ 0
English ☐ 1
English with another subject (specify) ____________ 2
Other Language (specify) ____________ 3
Other Humanities (specify) ____________ 4
Social Science (specify) ____________ 5
Natural Science (specify) ____________ 6
Other (specify) ____________ 7

94. Have you taken any undergraduate courses in English Literature?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip to question 96
Yes ☐ 1

Please do not wri
in this space

95. How useful do you consider your undergraduate course(s) in English Literature to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A I did not take any of these courses ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	___	___	___	___
Related language skills	___	___	___	___
Exposition:	___	___	___	___

96. Have you taken any undergraduate courses in English Language (as opposed to English Literature)?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip to question 102 ___

Yes ☐ 1

97. If so, please indicate which one of the following types of English Language courses you took at the undergraduate level, and whether the course extended for half or a full academic year.

	Half-year	Full-year	
Old English	___ 1	___ 2	___
Middle English	___ 1	___ 2	___
Old and Middle English	___ 1	___ 2	___
Old Norse	___ 1	___ 2	___
History of the English Language	___ 1	___ 2	___
Structure of Modern English	___ 1	___ 2	___
Survey of Grammatical Theories	___ 1	___ 2	___
Composition and Rhetoric	___ 1	___ 2	___
Other (specify) ______________	___ 1	___ 2	___

Please do not wri
in this space

98. How useful do you consider your undergraduate course(s) in Old or Middle English or Old Norse to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A, I did not take any of these courses ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	____	____	____	____
Related language skills:	____	____	____	____
Exposition:	____	____	____	____

99. How useful do you consider your undergraduate course in the History of the English Language to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A, I did not take this course ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	____	____	____	____
Related language skills:	____	____	____	____
Exposition:	____	____	____	____

100. How useful do you consider your undergraduate course(s) in the Structure of English or Survey of Grammatical Theories to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A, I did not take a course in either area ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	____	____	____	____
Related language skills:	____	____	____	____
Exposition:	____	____	____	____

101. How useful do you consider your undergraduate course(s) in Composition and Rhetoric to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A, I did not take such a course ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	____	____	____	____
Related language skills:	____	____	____	____
Exposition:	____	____	____	____

Please do not write in this space

102. How useful do you consider your undergraduate courses in subjects other than English language and literature to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

N/A, I did not take any such courses ☐ 3

	0. Not at all Useful	1. Somewhat Useful	2. Very Useful	
Writing generally:	___	___	___	___
Related language skills:	___	___	___	___
Exposition:	___	___	___	___

103. If you have taken any other undergradute course(s) which you found particularly useful in preparing you to teach writing in general, related language skills, or exposition in particular, please indicate what the course was, where you took it (e.g. Linguistics 1002, University of Ottawa), and the grade levels and teaching areas for which the course was most helpful.

N/A, No undergraduate course has been particularly helpful in teaching in these areas ☐ 0 ___

	Course	University	Grade Level(s)	Useful in Teaching which area(s)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

104. Please evaluate the emphasis placed on your own writing while you were an undergraduate. Was the emphasis ___

Non-existent? ___ 0

Very low? ___ 1

Intermittent? ___ 2

Quite high? ___ 3

Very high? ___ 4

Excessive? ___ 5

Please do not wri
in this space

105. Please add any further comments you would like to make on the relevance of university courses to the education of teachers, and the effectiveness of such courses in preparing teachers to teach writing (including exposition) and related language skills.

Please do not write in this space

SECTION E - OTHER TEACHER EDUCATION

106. Please indicate the year in which you were first awarded a certificate entitling you to teach, and identify the Teacher Education Faculty or College at which you received your training.

First Teaching Certificate awarded in 19 ______

Teacher Education Institution: ______________________________

City: ______________________________

Country: ______________________________

107. If your first certificate was different from your present certificate, please state what it was.

First certificate: Same as now ☐

OR: ______________________________

108. Have you taken other Faculty or Ministry of Education courses not required for your present certificate?

No ☐ 0 Yes ☐ 1

109. Including your practice teaching (if any), how long was the Teacher Education Program which you took to get your first Teaching Certificate?

Two summers with a one-year internship ☐

One year ☐

Two years ☐

Three years ☐

Four years ☐

Other (specify) ______________________________ ☐

110. The next questions are concerned with the courses you took at the teacher education institution you attended, i.e. the academic part of your training, excluding your practice teaching experience.

Did you take any specialized course aimed specifically at preparing you to teach either composition generally or exposition in particular at any grade levels?

No ☐ 0 ....If not, please go to question 112

Yes, a compulsory course in my program ☐ 1

Yes, an optional course ☐ 2

Please do not wri
in this space

111. How effective or useful do you consider this course to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching writing generally, language skills related to writing, or exposition in particular?

	Effectiveness			
	2. Considerable	1. Moderate	0. Little or none	
Writing generally	____	____	____	___
Related language skills	____	____	____	
Exposition	____	____	____	

112. Did you take any general course(s) aimed at preparing you to teach English as a whole at the Secondary level? ___

No ☐ 0 ....If not, skip to question 114

Yes, a compulsory course in my program ☐ 1

Yes, an optional course ☐ 2

113. How effective or useful do you consider this course to have been as a preparation for your work in teaching grades 9-13 in the following areas: secondary English as a whole, writing generally, language skills related to writing, and exposition?

	Effectiveness			
	2. Considerable	1. Moderate	0. Little or none	
Secondary English generally	____	____	____	___
Writing generally	____	____	____	___
Related language skills	____	____	____	___
Exposition	____	____	____	___

114. Did you take any general course(s) aimed at preparing you to teach Language Arts at any level between K-8?

No ☐ 0 .... If not, please skip to question 116 ___

Yes, a compulsory course in my program ☐ 1

Yes, an optional course ☐ 2

Please do not write in this space

115. How effective or useful do you consider this course to have been as a preparation for your work in grades 7 and 8 in teaching Language Arts as a whole, writing generally, related language skills, and exposition?

Effectiveness

	2. Considerable	1. Moderate	0. Little or none	
Language Arts 7 - 8	______	______	______	___
Writing generally	______	______	______	___
Related language skills	______	______	______	___
Exposition	______	______	______	___

116. Did you take any course in English composition or rhetoric aimed at improving your own writing skills?

No ☐ 0 ....If not, skip to question 118 ___

Yes, a compulsory course in my program ☐ 1

Yes, an optional course ☐ 2

117. How useful do you consider this course to have been as a preparation for teaching writing in general, related language skills and exposition in grades 7 - 13?

Effectiveness

	2. Considerable	1. Moderate	0. Little or none	
Writing generally	______	______	______	___
Related language skills	______	______	______	___
Exposition	______	______	______	___

118. Approximately what percentage of all your teacher education course work in all areas was devoted to instruction relating to the teaching of English (all subject areas of English) or Language Arts?

Can't say ☐ 01 OR: English teaching: __ __ % ___ ___

All other instruction: __ __ %

1 0 0 %

Please do not wri
in this space

119. Of all the instruction you received relating to the teaching of English or the Language Arts, approximately what percentage was devoted specifically to preparing you to teach exposition?

Can't say ☐ 01 OR: English teaching: ____ ____ %

All other instruction: ____ ____ %

1 0 0 %

120. At the Teacher Education institution you attended, how great an emphasis was placed on your ability to teach exposition?

3. Can't say	0. Little or none	1. Some	2. Considerable
____	____	____	____

121. At the Teacher Education institution you attended, were you required to hand in written assignments which were marked?

No ☐ 0 ....If not, skip to question 123

Yes ☐ 1

122. If so, to what extent were your written assignments marked in such a way as to indicate a serious concern on the part of the instructors with the writing abilities of student teachers (e.g. by pointing out particular strengths or weaknesses in your own writing)?

3. Can't say	0. Little or none	1. Some	2. Considerable
____	____	____	____

123. If, since you received your first Teaching Certificate, you have taken other Faculty or Ministry of Education courses which have been particularly helpful to you in teaching writing generally, related language skills, or exposition at grades 7 - 13, please indicate what they were and where and when you took them.

Course	Where taken	When	Useful at Grade level(s)	Useful in Teaching:

Please do not write
in this space

124. Did your Teacher Education Program include either an Internship or Practice Teaching?

No ☐ 0 ...If not, go on to question 138 ___
Yes, Practice Teaching ☐ 1
Yes, an Internship ☐ 2
Yes, both Practice Teaching and an Internship ☐ 3

125. How many weeks altogether did you spend in your Internship or Practice Teaching?

__________ weeks ___ ___

126. How was the time you spent in your Practice Teaching apportioned (e.g. one day per week for six weeks and two blocks of four weeks, or one block of eight weeks, or one day a week for two years, etc.)

N/A, I did an Internship ☐ 0

OR

____ day(s) a week for _____ weeks during _____ year(s) ___

and/or

____ block(s) of _____ week(s) ___ ___ ___

and

____ block(s) of _____ week(s) ___ ___ ___

and

____ block(s) of _____ week(s) ___ ___ ___

And/or some other combination (specify)_________________________ ___ ___ ___

127. During your Practice Teaching or Internship, were you able to observe English or Language Arts classes at grades 7 - 13?

No ☐ 0 ....If not, please skip to question 131 ___
Yes ☐ 1

128. If so, approximately what percentage of the total time you spent in observing classes at levels 7 - 13 was spent in observing English o Language Arts classes?

Can't say ☐ 01 OR: ___ ___
Observing English or Language Arts ___ ___ %
Observing all other subjects ___ ___ %
1 0 0 %

Please do not wri
in this space

129. During your observation of Language Arts or English classes, were you able to observe classes in exposition, other kinds of writing, or related language skills?

Exposition	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1		___
Other writing	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1		___
Related Language skills	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1		___

130. How useful do you consider your observation of other teachers during your Internship or Practice Teaching to have been as a preparation for your own work in teaching writing skills generally, language skills related to writing, and exposition in particular?

Can't say ☐ 3

OR: Usefulness:	0. Little or none	1. Moderate	2. Considerable	
Writing generally	___	___	___	___
Related language skills	___	___	___	___
Exposition	___	___	___	___

131 Did you teach English or Language Arts at grades 7 - 13 during your Internship or Practice Teaching?

No ☐ 0 ....If not, skip to question 136 ___

Yes ☐ 1

132. Approximately what percentage of the total time you spent teaching during your Internship or Practice Teaching was spent on teaching English or Language Arts?

Can't say ☐ 0

OR:

Time spent in teaching English ___ ___ % ___ ___

Time spent in teaching all other subjects ___ ___ %

1 0 0 %

133. In your Practice Teaching, were you able to conduct classes in exposition, other kinds of writing, or related language skills?

Exposition	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1	___
Other writing	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1	___
Related language skills	No ☐ 0	Yes ☐ 1	___

Please do not wri
in this space

134. How useful do you consider your actual teaching during your practice teaching as a preparation for your work teaching writing skills generally, related language skills, and exposition in particular?

Can't say ☐ 3

OR: Usefulness:	0. Little or none	1. Moderate	2. Considerable	
Writing generally	____	____	____	____
Related language skills	____	____	____	____
Exposition	____	____	____	____

135. To what extent were your Associate or Host Teachers' comments and advice useful in preparing you for your work in grades 7 - 13 as a teacher of English or Language Arts generally and of writing, related language skills and exposition?

Can't say ☐ 3

OR Usefulness:	0. Little or none	1. Moderate	2. Considerable	
All English or Language Arts	____	____	____	____
Writing generally	____	____	____	____
Related language skills	____	____	____	____
Exposition	____	____	____	____

136. Do you think that Associate and Host Teachers should have some kind of training before student teachers are assigned to them?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 0 ____

Don't know ☐ 3

137. Should Teacher Education Institutions be able to exercise more control over the teaching assignments given to students during their Practice Teaching?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 0 Don't know ☐ 3 ____

Please do not writ
in this space

138. Please rank the following aspects of teacher training in order of their usefulness to you in helping you to teach English or Language Arts between grades 7 - 13.

	Not Applicable	Rank Order	
1. Undergraduate English Language courses	______	______	___ ___ ___
2. Undergraduate English Literature courses	______	______	___ ___ ___
3. Other undergraduate courses	______	______	___ ___ ___
4. University courses taken since starting teaching	______	______	___ ___ ___
5. Courses taken at Teacher Education Institutions	______	______	___ ___ ___
6. Observation of teachers during Practice Teaching	______	______	___ ___ ___
7. Teaching during your Practice Teaching	______	______	___ ___ ___
8. Other Faculty or Ministry of Education courses taken since you started teaching	______	______	___ ___ ___
9. Other in-service training	______	______	___ ___ ___
10. Professional Development Day workshops, etc.	______	______	___ ___ ___

139. Please add any other comments you would like to make about teacher education, especially in relation to the teaching of English or Language Arts at grades 7 - 13.

Please do not wri
in this space

SECTION F - ATTITUDES TOWARDS ASPECTS OF LITERACY

In each of the questions which follow, three views are expressed about issues connected with the teaching of writing. Please indicate which of the three positions, in each case, most closely conforms to your own view.

140. a. "Pupils should be taught how to write in English courses and by English teachers; teachers in other courses should be able to take the writing abilities of their students for granted." ☐

b. "Writing should be taught primarily by English teachers, but all teachers have at least a limited responsibility to develop the writing abilities of their pupils." ☐

c. "All teachers, whether English specialists or not, have a major responsibility for developing pupils' writing abilities." ☐

141. a. "Training pupils in the principles of traditional 'prescriptive' grammar serves no good purpose, and represents a misguided and outdated approach towards developing writing abilities." ☐

b. "Young students acquire much of the grammar of their native language naturally, but formal training in traditional grammatical principles, at appropriate stages in their development, can refine their writing abilities by helping them to use language with precision and clarity." ☐

c. "Training in the principles of traditional grammar is immensely important for the development of writing abilities. Such training should begin in the early years, and should be reinforced throughout the student's career." ☐

142. a. "Spelling and punctuation are the least important aspects of writing; the teacher who frequently corrects such errors is likely to discourage the student and impede the development of writing abilities." ☐

b. "Spelling and punctuation are not to be discounted. The teacher should offer the student some training in both." ☐

c. "Spelling and punctuation have a central place in the spectrum of writing abilities; pupils leaving school must be able to spell correctly and punctuate appropriately." ☐

Please do not wri
in this space

143. a. "In the modern 'audio-visual' world, writing is becoming less and less important in the practical day-to-day life of the average citizen; unless a pupil is eager to acquire writing abilities, the teacher should not give undue attention to their development." ☐

b. "In recent years the basic writing skills have been under-emphasized in the school system. The pendulum has swung too far; the schools should place more emphasis on writing abilities, but should be careful not to overemphasize their importance." ☐

c. "It is essential that citizens should be able to read and write adequately. Practical considerations are not the only issue; the citizen who lacks skills in reading and writing is at the mercy of the political system, and is also deprived of enjoying many benefits of his cultural heritage. The importance of training students to read intelligently and to write well cannot be overemphasized." ☐

144. a. "For the rejected student, for students whose backgrounds neither prepare them to benefit from schools as they are usually organized nor help to advance them socially - for such students English, as a creative subject, can be a focus for reparative human contact. By encouraging students' own innate creativity in personal writing, the English teacher can bring them to that engagement with great literature which alone can protect them against a world of dehumanization." ☐

b. "Teaching writing by means of creative methodologies merely leaves children to circle endlessly in a colorful abundance of their own unchecked spontaneity. Basic skills such as spelling, punctuation, sentence structure and style are not merely put second to actual writing, but are ignored almost to the point of disappearing. This leaves students stewing in their own unformed linguistic juices - to nobody's advantage." ☐

c. "The teacher who does not ignore or inhibit children's innate linguistic creativity can, by means of carefully structured teaching, channel it in directions where it would not develop without teaching, and shape it to work its effects within acceptable or conventional limits." ☐

Please do not write in this space

145. Please add any any final comments you would like to make about any of the topics touched on in this questionnaire.